DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 440 915 SO 031 760

AUTHOR	Landman, Jonathan
TITLE	A State-Mandated Curriculum, A High-Stakes Test: One Massachusetts High School History Department's Response to a Very New Policy Context.
PUB DATE	2000-01-07
NOTE	119p.; Qualifying Paper, Harvard Graduate School of Education.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Departments; *Educational Change; *Educational Policy; Educational Research; Grade 10; Grade 4; Grade 8; High Schools; *High Stakes Tests; History; Language Arts; Mathematics; Sciences; Social Sciences; *State Standards; *Student Evaluation; *Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS	*Massachusetts

ABSTRACT

Following passage of the Massachusetts Education Reform Act in 1993, comprehensive statewide assessments to evaluate students' mastery of required content and skills were developed in the core academic areas of mathematics, language arts, science, and history and social science. By 1998, the state had established assessments at the fourth, eighth, and tenth grade levels using the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System test. A qualitative study explored how a varied group of four high school history/social science departments and the teachers in those departments were responding to this new policy: Were curricula and/or pedagogy changing? How did departments' members perceive the new framework and test? How did they perceive the impact of these new state initiatives? and How were these perceptions influencing the departments' responses? This case-study analysis of "Marwood," one of the four study sites, includes: fall and spring teacher interviews; a questionnaire and three interviews with the Department Head over the course of the year; spring interviews with Marwood's Superintendent and Assistant Superintendent; observational data including field notes; a survey of all interviewees; and departmental documents. Marwood's teachers articulated a range of substantive problems with the current framework and test. Data suggest that individual teachers' curricular ideologies influenced their responses to these policies. Faculty view their department as collegial and describe their departmental peers as engaged. The sense that they must align with the state framework to protect their students and themselves weighs heavily upon the Marwood faculty. Appendixes contain survey methods and findings, survey responses, information about Marwood High School, and a memorandum. (BT)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: SO

In our judgment, this document is also of interest to the Clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view TM

ED 440 915

A State-Mandated Curriculum, A High-Stakes Test: One Massachusetts High School History Department's Response To A Very New Policy Context

Qualifying Paper
Harvard Graduate School of Education
Jonathan Landman, L & T
January 7, 2000

SO 031 760

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Jonathan Landman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U S DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements .... page *i*

The Setting .... page 1

The Policy Context .... page 3

The Framework .... page 11

The Study Described .... page 14

Organizational Context .... page 16

The District and School .... page 16

The Department .... page 20

A Department in Transition .... page 30

How the Members of the Marwood Department See the State Framework page 33

The Administration's Message .... page 38

Contrasting Perspectives on the M.C.A.S. Test .... page 42

The Department's Response to the Curriculum Framework and M.C.A.S. page 46

Drag or Enhancement? .... page 57

The Need for Further Study .... page 65

Conclusions .... page 67

References .... page 71

Appendix One, Part One .... page 79

Part Two .... page 82

Part Three .... page 100

Appendix Two .... page 105

Appendix Three .... page 107

Appendix Four .... page 109

Acknowledgements

This is the first time in my career as a researcher that I have penned acknowledgements. This is a wonderful, humbling opportunity, for the moment I sit down to the task, the truth presents itself. My name may appear as the sole author of this work, but this paper would *never* have come into being had I been working alone.

My professors at Harvard – Kay Merseth, Susan Moore Johnson, and Sally Schwager – have guided me at each step along an arduous and long path. At its beginning, there was no more than a tangle of marginally-researchable questions. Now, as I near the end, with their help, I have arrived at a well-focused, tightly-planned research agenda. They have schooled me in the ways of proposal-writing, and challenged me to ground my assertions. They have kept me thinking and learning even when my own inclination would have been to take the easy way out. They have been scrupulous, insightful editors. At times, when I wondered if I would ever get this far, they have sustained me with reassurance and encouragement.

I shudder to think what it would have been like trying to get this far without the support of my "Q.P. Dolls" – student peers and friends, Deborah Donahue-Keegan, Jim Hammerman, and Karen Mutch-Jones. For two years, the four of us have met every week or two to take care of one another, and to press one another to do our best work. We have become invested in one another's work. The Dolls must have read and critiqued a dozen draft QP proposals before I got one good enough to submit! They've helped me think through every kind of problem, big and small, personal and professional. At every turn, this paper incorporates their creative and analytic insights. Thank you, QP Dolls, for being such staunch allies and friends-in-need.

Neither would this paper exist if not for the teachers and administrators of "Marwood." I cannot thank them enough for their open-ness, and for giving me of their time, repeatedly, over the past 15 months. It was no small thing to open their department meetings, to speak frankly in interviews or to share their department documents with a "Harvard researcher." I wish to publicly acknowledge the civic-mindedness of their decision to participate in this study. The staff in Marwood gave of their time because they wanted to help a young man along in his career, but also because they saw the state's new standards and tests as a sea-change in Massachusetts education, and recognized that by participating in research into its impact, they might contribute to educationally beneficial change.

Thanks, too, go to Ned Rossiter, Chair of the Newton North High School History Department, who has acted as my "bias auditor" throughout the proposal-writing and QP-writing process. Ned has read and critiqued my work, increasing my confidence that my approach has been fair and rigorous, while at the same time helping to point out gaps in my thinking, data, and perspective.

Also, I wish to acknowledge the help that I have received from professors Leslie Siskin and Paul Gagnon, each of whose work has influenced my thinking. At critical junctures, each helped me to think my way through thorny research problems.

Closer to home, I need, here, also, to thank my parents. At root, I believe that their love for learning and teaching, their enthusiastic and constant support

for my personal growth, were the inspiration behind both my teaching career and my decision to seek a doctorate. Thanks too, to all my supportive friends, who've cheered me every step of the way.

Finally, and most importantly, I need to thank my wife and life-partner Joan. How can I possibly say enough, Joan? Together, we've kept our sense of humor. You've had faith in me, even though for five years – with our family growing – my earnings have been negligible to negative. You've guided me through all the craziness of graduate school, and helped me to keep my eyes on the prize at the other end. We've been through some stresses and strains, but because of you, it has also been a time of deepening love, of joy and of growth.

Thanks so much to you all!
Jonathan Landman

The Setting

With its sprawling, 1960's-style institutional quadrangles, parking lots, and playing fields, Marwood High School (a pseudonym) resembles many northeastern suburban high schools. Marwood is a mostly prosperous, mostly white "economically developed suburb" (Massachusetts Department of Education, 1985). In 1995, the Marwood schools' $5500 per pupil budget was around $800.00, above the statewide average. While only 37% of American high school juniors took the SAT in 1997, here in Marwood there was 89% participation. Among districts within the Route 495 ring-road surrounding Boston, the high school's 1997 average combined math and verbal SAT score put the district in the 3rd highest quartile. In 1997, just 8.5% of the students in the district qualified for reduced-price or free lunch, and only 12% of the graduating seniors planned to go directly to work (statistics from Massachusetts Department of Education, 1998).

There are 11 teachers in the M.H.S. social studies department. Eight or nine of the department's members have master's degrees and one has a doctorate. All are white; seven of eleven are men. There are two newer and younger female teachers in the department, and two men who have been here for under a decade. The remaining teachers are very experienced veterans, who have been in Marwood for many years.

As throughout the state, this is a period of upheaval in Marwood's high school social studies department. In 1993, the Massachusetts legislature enacted the Massachusetts Education Reform Act. Among its sweeping provisions, the Education Reform Act called for 'standards-led' reform, i.e. the development of statewide learning standards and, aligned with those standards, comprehensive statewide assessments to evaluate students' mastery of the required content and skills (Massachusetts State Legislature, 1993). Following passage of this law, the Massachusetts Department of Education (D.O.E.) undertook a public process to develop curriculum frameworks in the state's four designated 'core' academic areas of Mathematics, 'English Language Arts', Science, and 'History and Social Science'. Traditionally, curriculum had been developed and controlled by local districts. Never before had the state prescribed curricula for public schools.

By 1998, the state had established assessments at the 4th, 8th and 10th grade levels, and had declared that starting with the class of 2003, students who had not passed the 10th-grade Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (M.C.A.S.) test would not receive diplomas (Howe, 1998). In May 1999, along with tests in the other core academic areas, all students were required to take a history and social sciences (H./S.S.[1]) test for a score. In September 1999, Governor Cellucci declared his intent to grade schools on the basis of their M.C.A.S. scores, and the state Board of Education declared that it would begin using the scores to evaluate schools' performance (Daley, 1999).

---

[1] Throughout this paper, the abbreviation 'H./S.S.' is employed as short-hand, in reference to the History and Social Science framework and M.C.A.S. test, but also in reference to History, Social Studies, and History *and* Social Studies departments, curricula, and teachers. It is important to acknowledge that using the abbreviation interchangeably, in reference to any of these entitities glosses over what many people consider to be important distinctions among them. Some departments, Marwood among them, describe themselves as *only* Social Studies departments, others as *only* History departments, and others as a combination of the two. The state's decision to call the state framework a History and Social *Science* rather than Social *Studies* curriculum was itself a pointed commentary on the framework crafters' opinion of 'Social Studies' education. While these distinctions are very important to high school teachers and to scholars, I felt it was reasonable to employ the abbreviation in reference to all meanings, here, since the distinctions are not directly relevant to the analysis presented in this case.

How are these new policies changing curriculum and instruction? Research on the impact of Massachusetts' education reform is "desperately needed" (Reville, 1999). According to Talbert, McLaughlin and Rowan,

> Case studies ... can describe ... how state or local curriculum policies ... work through and within the school or subject context to shape classroom activities and outcomes. Such analyses of *change processes* and of the *meanings* of and *complex interactions* among context conditions ... [are] essential to policymaker[s].... (Talbert, McLaughlin, & Rowan, 1993, pp. 60-1)

This is a case study exploring how Marwood's H./S.S. department and the teachers in it are responding to the establishment of this new, statewide H./S.S. curriculum framework and new high-stakes test. The case study begins by examining the complex context surrounding Marwood's high school history department at this time of change.

The Policy Context

Over the last decade, states throughout the nation have enacted standards-led reforms (Lewis, 1995; Wolk & Olson, 1997). While there is not space here for a complete review of the arguments in favor of standards-led reform, a statement released by the nation's governors at the end of the 1996 National Education Summit sums up the main idea.

> We believe that efforts to set clear, common state and/or community-based academic standards for students ... are necessary to improve student performance.... [W]ithout a clear articulation of the skills needed, specific agreement on the academic content students should be learning,

> clear goals for what needs to be accomplished, and authentic and accurate systems to tell us how well schools and students are doing, efforts to improve our schools will lack direction (National Education Summit, 1996, p. 11).

Since its inception, skeptics have been critical of the movement. I review the critics' ideas more carefully, because their analyses underlie much of what follows in this case study. Their reasoning falls into two stages.

First, scholarship has shown that "it is incredibly hard" to implement even uncontroversial education policies (Ball & Bowe, 1992; Elmore & McLaughlin, 1988; Geller & Johnston, 1990; McLaughlin, 1987, p. 172; Pressman & Wildavsky, 1979; Weick, 1976). Advocates of standards-led reform hope that systematization of public education will systematically yield improvements. One example is the belief statement from the National Education Summit, quoted above (also see, e.g., American Federation of Teachers, 1996b, pp. 4-5). Critics contend, however, that in America, the link between educational policy and classroom practice has historically been "loosely coupled" (Weick, 1976). Thus, creating systems up top often does not yield systematization down below (Cohen, 1995; Ravitch, 1995, pp. 19 – 20, 23 – 24; Smith, 1996). For example, if teachers do not agree with an external agenda, there is no reason to assume that they will implement it (Elmore & McLaughlin, 1988; O'Day, 1996, citing Darling Hammond). Teachers, as professionals, may place their accountability to a state mandate below other considerations. As Smith puts it:

> [P]olicy makers draw on a political model of accountability. This model assumes that the larger community and its elected representatives have a right … to hold public institutions answerable…. [T]he professional

> model bases its claims on experts' mastery of a specialized body of knowledge.... The application of professional knowledge to individual clients' needs requires judgment, so it cannot be reduced to rules or prescriptions for practice; thus professionals require autonomy from external political control in determining how the products of their expertise should be used (Smith, 1996, pp. 408-9).

Second, historically, policy results have often borne little resemblance to policymakers' intentions (Elmore & McLaughlin, 1988; Pressman & Wildavsky, 1979; Tyack & Cuban, 1995). If departments and teachers do implement change in response to the establishment of standards and assessments, critics wonder if the results will resemble the intentions, and if those results will be constructive (e.g., Cohen, 1995; Porter, Smithson, & Osthoff, 1994; Stevenson & Baker, 1991).

Implementation problems arise when policymakers attempt to over-control complex tasks. "Rather than increasing control, they increase complexity. And as complexity increases, control itself is threatened" (Elmore, 1983, p. 342). Standards-led reform is vulnerable to these problems: it introduces highly complex state-mandated curricula into the already complex, 'uncertain' realm of the classroom (Elmore & McLaughlin, 1988; Lortie, 1975; McDonald, 1992). Sociologists and policy scholars argue that "[w]hen tasks are varied and unpredictable... when learning is important in the task situation ... [e.g., in teaching], discretion is necessary.... This is where the professional in the organization takes on new importance...." (Darling-Hammond, Chajet, & Robertson, 1996, p. 256, citing Benveniste) (see also, Elmore, 1983; Mohrman & Lawler, 1996, pp. 127-8; Scott & Cohen, 1995). Archbald and Porter paraphrase McNeil's concerns in this regard:

> … prescribing curricula and instruments of assessments ... separate[s] the craft of teaching from teaching style and remove[s] teachers' discretion from their judgements about students and what they need to know. In this de-skilled model of teaching … the teacher becomes little more than an assembly line worker, performing mechanical tasks (Archbald & Porter, 1994, citing McNeil, 1988, p. 335).

Thus, though standards-led reform aspires to raise the quality of American education, critics contend that standardization may reduce teachers' effectiveness. For example, introducing a standard or common core may make it more difficult to tailor curriculum and pedagogy to students' needs and interests. It also means giving teachers less leeway to teach to their passions. Standards may not be conducive to fostering students' discovery or their idiosyncratic interests and interpretations (Eisner, 1995; Powell, 1996).

Critics attack standards for other reasons, too. Standards amount to one group asserting an educational agenda to the exclusion of others (Madaus & Kellaghan, 1992; Pressman & Wildavsky, 1979, p. 90; Ravitch, 1995, citing; Sizer & Rogers, 1993). Critics ask whether mandated educational uniformity is a positive development (Eisner, 1995; Meier & Kohn, 1998). Assessment experts warn that in nations with high-stakes exams, important "subjects, knowledge and skills not examined are not as valued or emphasized in schools as those that are" (Madaus & Kellaghan, 1992, p. 90).

To sum up, "Most of the research literature is critical of efforts to control teachers through top-down central policies, yet solutions suggested for educational problems typically include strengthening central control and limiting teacher choice" (Floden et al., 1988, pp. 98-9). If this centralization of control over curriculum continues, what will be the outcome?

Nationally, the establishment of standards in the History and Social Studies (H./S.S.) subject area has been even more controversial than the establishment of standards in other subject areas. Advocates argue that standards in H./S.S. will foster cultural literacy (Hirsch, 1984) and foster a collectively held national identity (Schlesinger, 1992). Opponents worry that uniform H./S.S. standards are, or could become, anti-democratic (Ravitch, 1995, pp. 19-20; Ross, 1996).

Among those who agree that some kind of standards in H./S.S. would be constructive, there now exist broad areas of agreement as well as areas of intense controversy. Historically, there has been wide-ranging and heated disagreement in this country over what H./S.S. education ought to encompass (Gagnon, 1988; Nash, Crabtree, & Dunn, 1997). In recent years, advocates of multicultural curriculum have been in conflict with proponents of more traditional western-centered curricula . Conflicts have also erupted between groups favoring curricula which paint a rosy, mostly uncritical portrait of American history, and groups promoting curricula exploring American history, "warts and all" (Cornbleth & Waugh, 1995; Nash et al., 1997). In 1995, for example, the content of federally-funded National Standards for U.S. History (which took both the multicultural, and the warts-and-all approaches) were attacked and roundly condemned (by a vote of 99-1) on the floor of the U.S. Senate (U.S. Congress, 1995).

Given the controversies over which content to include, in any attempt to establish H./S.S. standards, "pressures to include coverage of everyone's ancestors [and] … multiple perspectives … threaten to … turn the [standards] into an encyclopedia instead of content standards that identify key concepts and essential knowledge and skills" (Ravitch, 1995, pp. 173-4).

Despite and amidst the controversy over H./S.S. standards, in the years since publication of *A Nation at Risk* (National Commisssion on Excellence in Education, 1983), in addition to the National Standards for U.S. History, there have been numerous other, nationally influential efforts to articulate the characteristics of good H./S.S. curriculum and teaching, and to identify K-12 H./S.S. learning standards. While the controversies over H./S.S. curriculum have probably been much more visible to the public, in a systematic survey of twelve of the most prominent of these nationally-promulgated documents (see Appendix One),[2] I found ten major areas of consensus regarding the characteristics of good H./S.S. curriculum and pedagogy, and only half that number of points of contention. There was strong national consensus among the standards documents – *of course, those who believe that crafting common standards is a bad idea may not share in this consensus* – that H./S.S. curriculum:

1. Is articulated, and provides students with H./S.S. instruction almost every year, kindergarten through 12th grade.
2. Exposes all students to a common core of knowledge and skills. That core incorporates a balance of western and non-western, canonical and non-canonical content. (However, each framework struck that balance

---

[2] I conducted this survey to identify where national consensus exists regarding what constitutes good H./S.S. curriculum and pedagogy. Later in this paper, I employ the results of this survey to make judgements regarding curricular and pedagogical changes which are taking place in Marwood. A complete description of the survey methodology, and a full reporting of survey results (more detailed than the report made in this paper), is provided in Appendix One.

somewhat differently. Battles over which content to include and exclude from the 'core' have been at the heart of most of the controversies over H./S.S. curricula.[3])

3. Leaves local districts and teachers room for flexible exercise of professional discretion.

Likewise, there was strong national consensus that good H./S.S. curriculum and pedagogy:

4. Takes time for in-depth topical exploration.[4]
5. Employs varied, hands-on teaching strategies
6. Incorporates varied teaching materials, presenting multiple perspectives on topics and issues.
7. Fosters students' higher-order thinking skills, and encourages students to construct their own meaning or interpretations of controversial topics.

Taken together, these areas of consensus outline a particular vision of good H./S.S. curriculum and pedagogy. In this vision students are, first, exposed to the complex wellsprings and lines of development of American civilization and values, and given the opportunity to think about and debate and reckon for themselves both the historical and contemporary meaning of that heritage. Second, students are given the opportunity to place that American heritage, and modern America, in some meaningful relationship with the histories of other civilizations around the globe. Throughout this process, teachers are to employ creative, varied, challenging classroom strategies to flexibly respond to the particular needs and interests of their own students, thus making more immediate the connections between students' lives and the core H./S.S. knowledge and skills. Ultimately, H./S.S. education is to forge independent, intellectually and socially-skilled, civic-minded citizens.

---

[3] The areas of consensus and conflict over which content to include or leave out were too numerous to unpack in my survey, and in any case were not really relevant to this study.

[4] Regarding points three and four: while many of the frameworks acknowledged the importance of curricular breadth, there was *rhetorical* consensus that good H./S.S. pedagogy requires in-depth topical exploration, *and* that H./S.S. standards and/or curricula should be open enough to allow local districts and teachers discretionary flexibility. However, as Ravitch warned, frameworks' rhetorical arguments for depth and for local discretion were often contradicted by the tremendous quantity of content these frameworks prescribed or recommended. A philosophical commitment to deep exploration and local discretion often (though not always) appears to have been overwhelmed by the process of developing curriculum via democratic compromise. To resolve or avert battles over which content to include and which to leave out, it would seem that framework-crafters opted to leave tremendous numbers of topics in.

In addition to debating over which content to include as "core knowledge," however, the national standards documents certainly *do* lack consensus on some critical questions:

1. Should H./S.S. curriculum be organized around a disciplinary core (e.g., history, geography, or economics)?
2. How much time should be allowed for H./S.S. electives in high school?
3. Is content more valuable to students if it has tangible contemporary relevance?
4. Should H./S.S. curriculum require students to participate in civic activity or local politics?
5. Should students be tracked or un-tracked?

While the Massachusetts D.O.E.'s efforts to craft curricular frameworks in other core academic areas moved ahead briskly after 1993, in H./S.S. Massachusetts' experience mirrored the national context. Ideological conflicts led to a highly contentious standards-writing process (Parson, 1998). Research has shown that without teacher commitment, policies aimed at improving student learning are doomed to failure (e.g., Cohen, 1988; Elmore & McLaughlin, 1988; O'Day, 1996). In Massachusetts, although the legislature mandated an inclusive process, critics of that process assert that conservatives on the Board of Education excluded their political opponents and public school teachers from the standards-writing process for six months (French, 1998; Parson, 1998). Ultimately, the H./S.S. frameworks were adopted late (in September 1997).

The Framework

It is not surprising, then, that the Massachusetts History and Social Science Curriculum framework published by the state in September 1997 is also reflective of the national context in other respects. In three pages, the framework begins by laying down and explaining some "guiding principles," including the following: that H./S.S. should be studied every year from kindergarten through 12th grade; that the curriculum should be articulated to include review of key topics and concepts but to avoid needless gaps and repetitions; that the curricular focus in H./S.S. should be upon the disciplines of history, geography, economics and civics/government, with history as the organizing core.

Next, the framework devotes two pages to a description of the complex set of intellectual skills and habits which H./S.S. should teach. For instance, this section asserts that: "good teachers... illuminate [H./S.S. concepts] by concentrating on the specific 'how to' knowledge students need in order to understand subject matter content...." Numerous examples are given. For example:

- "how to gather, interpret, and assess evidence from multiple and sometimes conflicting sources....

- how to identify valid and fallacious arguments; how to test hypotheses; how to identify and avoid bias and prejudice…."
  (Massachusetts Department of Education, 1997, pp. 11-12)

With regard to each of the above characteristics (the historical disciplinary core excepted), the Massachusetts framework is in line with the consensus among national H./S.S. curricular documents.

Given the political battles over its creation, and given the track record of national standard-writing groups, it is likewise not surprising that the Massachusetts framework has been criticized for mandating "encyclopedic" content coverage (e.g., Borenstein, 1998; McNamara, 1998a; Sills, 1999). The forty-one pages of the framework which follow the articulation of skills, are devoted to a chronological list of topics and sub-topics to cover between kindergarten and the end of 12th grade, including instructions regarding which content to cover in which year. In the 9th and 10th grade years, students are to cover 51 historical topics (e.g., one topic is titled "Western Feudalism, Manorialism, Religion; The Three Social Estates") and 258 sub-topics from all parts of the globe, beginning with the fall of Rome and ending with the information age. In 11th grade, students are to study 31 topics in U.S. History, from 1865 to the present. In the senior year, the state recommends a 1-semester capstone course in Civics and Government, and one semester for electives.

The framework is a complex document. Following the guiding principles, the articulation of core skills, and the chronological listing of topics, the last significant sections of the framework (over sixty-five pages in length) describe the 'Learning Standards' within each of the four disciplinary 'Strands' (History, Geography, Economics, and Government/Civics). There are between four and six 'standards' in each strand. Though the framework document devotes fifty-one pages to providing examples of approaches that might be used, at each grade level, to teach these standards, it is by no means clear what the state has in mind when it dubs these items "standards." Some of them are clearly themes that the state wishes to see emphasized. In the history strand, for example, one of the standards is titled "Society, Diversity, Commonality and the Individual." Beneath the standard title, there is half a page of text, including the following: "Students should be expected to learn of the complex interplay that has existed from the beginning of our country between American ideals and American practice...." (Massachusetts Department of Education, 1997, p. 65) Other standards appear to articulate important skills and/ or knowledge that students should learn. For example, under the geography strand, there is a standard titled "Physical Spaces of the Earth," which states in part that "[s]tudents will describe the earth's natural features and their physical and biological characteristics...." (p. 67) The introductions to each strand's standards make clear that teaching the standards means teaching particular values. For example, "[s]tudents need to learn that the future of freedom can never be taken for granted" (p. 72) and that "[k]nowing the past is a precondition to making responsible choices in the present" (p. 64). The themes, skills and values included in these Learning Standards are so numerous and overlap in such a complex fashion that, given the limitations of my survey of the national standards documents, I am unable to conclude definitively that, taken together, they mirror a national consensus on H./S.S. curriculum. However, most of the priorities outlined in this last part of the framework are similar or identical to priorities laid down repeatedly in the national documents.

The Study Described

I am a veteran H./S.S. teacher who prized professional autonomy. I have struggled to develop curricula for, and to effectively teach, World History survey courses. From its inception, I have had concerns about the state's curricular mandate. In the last 18 months, I have also developed concerns about the structure and content of the H./S.S. M.C.A.S. test.

Given the standing questions about whether and how standards-led reform might influence schools; given the particularly complex mix of controversy and consensus that are both inherent in H./S.S. and swirling around Massachusetts' own H./S.S. framework; given the newness, the encyclopedic scope, and the complexity of the state's curriculum framework and of the state's efforts to assess students' mastery of its contents; and given my own professional background, I set out in the fall of 1998 to explore qualitatively how a varied group of four high school H./S.S. departments and the teachers in those departments were responding to this controversial new policy. Were curricula and or pedagogy changing in these departments? If so, how? How did departments' members perceive the new framework and test? How did they perceive the impact of these new state initiatives? How were these perceptions influencing the departments' responses?

Data collection took place in four phases: an initial phase before districts had received their first M.C.A.S. scores; a second phase after scores had been received, a third phase just prior to administration of the second round of M.C.A.S. tests, and a fourth phase immediately following test administration.

In light of teachers' central role in any attempt to influence student learning, it was necessary to examine their individual responses to the policies. It was also necessary to examine departmental responses. In secondary schools, decisions about the curriculum have typically been the purview of subject departments (Siskin, 1994). Teachers within departments often share goals, interpretations, and ways of thinking (Scott & Cohen, 1995). Departments also vary profoundly from one another, and they respond differently to external policies (Ball & Bowe, 1992; Ball & Lacey, 1995; Siskin, 1994; Smith, 1996; Talbert, 1995). No subject departments are more varied from one another nor likely to contain more internal diversity than H./S.S. departments (Siskin, 1994; Stodolsky & Grossman, 1995). I wondered how the responses of faculty in various departments would differ. I wondered whether Massachusetts' single H./S.S. framework, distributed to every school in the state would, like systemic reforms elsewhere, enhance teaching in some departments while creating "drag" in others (Smith, 1996), and if so, what that drag or enhancement would look like.

This paper is a case-study analysis of "Marwood," one of the four study sites. The study is based on a wide variety of materials (Patton, 1990, pp. 54, 385-6), collected over the four phases of data collection. Data include:

8. fall and spring interviews with two teachers,
9. spring interviews with two more teachers,
10. a questionnaire and three interviews undertaken with the Department Head over the course of the year,
11. spring interviews with Marwood's Superintendent and Acting Assistant Superintendent,

12. observational data including field notes collected at department meetings,
13. a survey of all interviewees, and
14. departmental documents.

Organizational Context

Theory predicts, and research has in the past shown, that the policy responses of a department will be strongly influenced by the district and school-level organizational context in which that department operates (Bowe, Ball, & Gold, 1992, p. 101; Scott & Cohen, 1995; Talbert et al., 1993), by the nature of the department's leadership (Bowe et al., 1992, p. 103), and by the department's "strength" (e.g., Scott & Cohen, 1995, pp. 51-2). The Marwood case-analysis begins, therefore, with an exploration of the H./S.S. department's district and school context and then of the department's characteristics.

The District and School

Historically, Marwood high school's H./S.S. teachers have not been fans of the district's or school's administrators. Veteran Doris Springer (like all study participants' names, a pseudonym) characterized the historical teacher-administrator relationship as "poor;" "I just find that they are very out of touch... with what the day-to-day realities... are." Other veterans asserted that former administrations had tended to "shove" their initiatives "down peoples' throats," had "stifled talent," and "hard-balled" people too much of the time. Department Head Don Caruso consistently referred to system administrators as "they," and to his departmental colleagues as "we."

Perhaps the tension was a by-product of a very hierarchical administrative structure. The acting Assistant Superintendent in Marwood describes it this way:

> .... [E]verything we do is focused on the goals. And the goals emanate from essentially the Superintendent ... approved by the school committee, and then each level, each principal, each building, develops a set of goals which are in concert with the Superintendent's goals. But also they are meeting specific needs of the school.

Don Caruso also experiences the administrative structure as top-down. When M.C.A.S. scores arrived in his district, for example, he says:

> they came to the central office. Then they did whatever they wanted to do with them. Then they released them to the different buildings. And then from the building principals, they released them to the Department Heads, and then down to the staff. So it was kind of a chain....

In the first few years after the passage of the Education Reform Act, anticipating the arrival of curriculum frameworks in all subject areas, the central administration undertook a number of reform initiatives. First, teachers across the system were required to participate in Jon Saphier's "Research for Better Teaching" (R.B.T.) course, which encourages teachers to employ varied teaching techniques in their classrooms to address varied student learning styles. Second, faculty were also required to participate in a program called "Writing Across the Curriculum" which employed the "Collins method," designed to increase the use of writing assignments in all subject areas and to foster a methodical approach to writing instruction and assessment. Finally, the faculty in each department were required to 'write up' detailed course syllabi for each level of every one of their courses.

These mandates have clearly created a context within which the state's new curricular and pedagogical challenges are considered. On the one hand, the mandates were and are a source of teacher cynicism. As veteran Doris Springer put it, the write-up of course syllabi was "really tedious." "It didn't come from teacher need; it came from administrative need…." She said she never used the materials she and her colleagues had developed. "I guess I just see that some place there exists what looks like this fabulous collection of stuff, public documents that become transferable for these [administrators] as they apply for other jobs." She had similar feelings about R.B.T. and Writing Across the Curriculum. Likewise, veteran Michael Smith quipped that he and his colleagues "still" made the teaching of writing a priority *"despite"* the administration's writing program. In his view, the R.B.T. workshops had been no more useful.

On the other hand, unlike Springer, Smith made clear that he followed the curricular plans which the district had required him and his colleagues to craft. Jessica Farmer, a new teacher, described these guides as extremely useful, and the Department Chair used these curricular guides as well. In fact, Caruso had clearly been influenced by both of the professional development mandates and was not at all cynical about either of them. He described R.B.T.'s 'student-centered' approach as challenging. "For the people transitioning, myself included, it was [hard]…." "What I was brought up with, the teacher come in and lectured." He described how he now varies his classroom strategies to meet varied students' needs. Likewise, rather than declaring his dedication to writing instruction despite administrative meddling, he acknowledged that "they want us to do more writing" and described how, on the basis of the Collins approach, he had altered his approach to assessment of students' written work.

In the fall of 1997, M.H.S. got a new principal. Also, in 1998, the man who had for fourteen years been Marwood's Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum was appointed Acting Superintendent. He was then appointed Superintendent in January 1999. When appointed Acting Superintendent, he brought in a retired Assistant Superintendent from another district to assist him in the position of Acting Superintendent for Curriculum which he had just vacated. Thus, in the last two years, the administration overseeing M.H.S. has undergone significant change. Even though the same man who, as Assistant Superintendent, had overseen the curriculum-writing project, the R.B.T. and Writing Across the Curriculum initiatives is now the Superintendent, all the teacher interviewees seemed willing to give his new leadership team a chance to prove itself different from its predecessor. Springer was typical when she mused that "I ... hope that we might be moving in a more positive direction.... I hope [the new Superintendent] might be ... more neutral, or flexible."

Perhaps department members' optimistic take on the new administrative team stemmed from the administration's recent flexibility relative to the department, a flexibility which seems to indicate an openness to less hierarchical administrative structures. When the department's last Chair was preparing to retire, two department members had successfully persuaded the administration to allow the department to elect one of its own members for a three-year rotation into the Chair. No other department had ever been allowed to try such an arrangement. Two teachers had run for the Chairmanship that first time, and

Caruso had won; 1997-8 was his first year as Chair, and he planned to retire at the end of the 1999-00 school year.

The Department

If the H./S.S. faculty's relationship with the central administration was still a work-in-progress, the department faculty expressed the highest possible regard for their own Department administrator. Prior research suggests how significant strong departmental leadership can be. According to Ball and Bowe, when Britain established a National Curriculum:

> [T]he skills and expertise of Heads of Departments (HOD's), their capacity to make sense of change for or with colleagues, [were] crucial resources, and a significant point of variation in the engagement of a department with National Curriculum texts.... Not all HODs [were] equally well equipped to carry this off.... (Ball & Bowe, 1992, p. 103)

Department members each showered high praise on Department Head Caruso. Like her colleagues, Farmer couldn't "say enough good things about" Caruso's community-building skills, or the support he had provided his colleagues. "And he is always one hundred percent behind the teachers." Paul Brodkey's expansiveness was typical:

> I've worked in many different places. This is very unique. People in this department get along very well. There is no jealousy.... There is no pecking order within the department. They're very willing to share ideas. They're very willing to share material.... This is a wonderful department.... A lot of that has to do with Don Caruso.... He eliminates a lot of bureaucracy ... Teachers would like to be able to go into their

> classroom, help their kids learn and not have to be worried about all the other mundane tasks that go along with teaching.... He lets you do your job. He treats you as a professional.

During my interview with him, Superintendent Fein questioned Caruso's capacity to be a curricular leader for his department. The faculty's comments strongly suggest that whether or not Caruso thinks deeply about curriculum, he possesses Ball's "capacity to make sense of change ... with colleagues."

Siskin defines departmental strength as an organizational characteristic with academic implications. "Where friendship and support sustain professional effort, where teachers are highly engaged, where constructive conversations and decisions about teaching occur, strong departments are there in the background." (Siskin, 1994, p. 13). In her study of high school subject departments, Siskin surveyed teachers and others to assess subject departments' organizational "strength" (Siskin, 1994, p. 105). In part on the basis of her survey results, Siskin distinguished among departments with differing degrees of cohesion and direction. In her terminology, weaker departments may be "fragmented" or "split." On the other end of the spectrum,

> *Bonded* departments represent the 'socially cohesive community' ... where members all work collaboratively with a high degree of commitment toward departmental goals. *Bundled* departments are high on inclusivity, but commitment to a common purpose is low" (Siskin, 1994, pp. 99-100).

In her study, she found that most departments were bundled.

For this study, I adopted elements of Siskin's survey instrument, adding a number of new items to probe for particular characteristics which might indicate departmental strength and weakness in the H./S.S. subject-area context (Survey results are presented in table form in Appendix Two). Department members shared Brodkey's positive characterization of community in the department. In my survey, three of four teachers and Caruso "strongly agreed," and the fourth teacher and Superintendent "agreed" that "you can count on most department members to help out anywhere, any time – even though it may not be part of their official assignment." All interviewees "strongly disagreed" with the assertion that, "There is little or no cooperative effort among teachers in this department." Veteran Smith says his colleagues are "the best," and 2nd-year teacher Farmer says, "everybody is not only cordial and courteous, but supportive of each other. Nobody ever seems to have a personal clash or a personal problem. We are always very professional to each other. It's just a terrific, terrific atmosphere." Clearly, the members of the M.H.S. H./S.S. department view their department as a friendly and supportive environment.

Members see their department as very strong in other respects, as well. Four of five surveyed department members strongly agreed with each of the following statements:

"Teachers in this department are continually learning and seeking new ideas."

"Teachers in this department are highly knowledgeable in their fields." Springer and the Superintendent agreed, though not strongly, with each of these statements. Three of five department members strongly agreed that their colleagues were "passionate about their work." The Superintendent and the other two teachers agreed, though not strongly.

Four teachers strongly disagreed that "department members' academic standards for students are very low." The Department Chair also disagreed, though not strongly, with this statement. The Superintendent neither agreed nor disagreed with the survey statement, commenting that:

> …in some classes, I see the academic standards as a six on a five-point scale. I'm really pleased. As a department, I would like to see academic standards raised…. I would like certain kinds of requirements in a given year. For instance, you do a major report in one year. You do a study … on the internet [the next, etc.]

On two fronts, the data suggest that the Marwood H./S.S. department is unusually strong – in Siskin's terminology, more "bonded" than "bundled." *First*, the community is socially cohesive. Teachers at M.H.S. share enthusiastic loyalty for their Chair, who has a unique status in the district. Teachers characterize their department as a place where colleagues like one another, and most see it as a place where teachers collaborate regularly. As Siskin asserts, departmental strength has academic implications. These department members (and to a slightly lesser degree, their Superintendent) express respect for their colleagues' professionalism, for their level of academic training, knowledge and engagement, and for the academic standards they set for students.

Second, to use Siskin's phrasing, there is also evidence that this faculty share a "commitment towards" curricular "goals" – to the teaching of skills (analysis, organization, writing), as well as to varied, active pedagogical strategies employing varied source material presenting multiple perspectives on topics/issues. There is strong consensus among the national H./S.S. curricular documents that these goals are vital elements of good H./S.S. pedagogy and curriculum (see Appendix One). Perhaps even more than collaboration and professionalism, these shared commitments have 'academic implications.'

In general, teachers in this department wanted students to get exposure to, and to retain, historical content knowledge. Their first shared priority, however, was to foster good skill development. In describing the department's 9th grade course, Caruso repeatedly emphasized the "skills that we have to encourage ... like having a notebook, having a portfolio, being organized." He mused that he didn't know "if each topic is ... important.... The issue is, can a kid write, and how does he express himself?" Smith acknowledged the importance of broad cultural literacy, but gave "reading, writing, thinking" pride of place. Like Farmer, Doris Springer emphasized "... thinking about history and evaluating history as opposed to an over-emphasis on having to know every single fact and content piece." The "General Overview" of the department's curricular materials, which was crafted by the faculty in the mid-1990's, also emphasizes skills. It groups them into three categories: "acquiring information, organizing and using information, and developing interpersonal skills" (See Appendix Three).

One example of the department's shared commitment to skills is teachers' expressed commitment to the teaching of writing. In addition to individual teachers' assertions that they placed an emphasis on student writing, in the survey, four of five teachers strongly agreed and the fifth agreed that "teachers in this department regularly assign essays and papers." Likewise, four of five teachers strongly disagreed and the fifth disagreed with the assertion that "in this department, teachers rarely or never read multiple drafts of their students' essays and papers."

There is also evidence – though more mixed – that teachers in Marwood share a conception of what constitutes good H./S.S. pedagogy. When I asked each teacher to describe a unit he or she had taught that had been "particularly good or strong," each interviewee described a unit or exercise that included hands-on, deep experiential learning experiences for their students. Examples included:

A. a two-week unit within which students role-played the Sacco and Vanzetti trial;
B. an in-class, simulated Neolithic archaeological dig;
C. a research paper unit.

In the department's curricular documents, almost every unit plan includes descriptions of historical simulations, cooperative learning activities, discussions, art projects, and the like.

When I asked teachers to describe the role of textbooks in their own classes and curricula, Farmer said: "I use the textbook to set the tone for what we're covering... but I use a lot of stuff outside of the textbook." Smith described how he teaches a sociology course in which he almost never uses a textbook, but also survey courses in which textbooks are "sometimes nightly reading, sometimes background reading." Springer asserted that her classes "are designed around supplemental material, almost entirely." Curricular documents from the department's survey courses include some unit plans which refer to supplemental readings and audio-visual materials, and others which list only a chapter or two from the textbook.

Taken together with the descriptions of their good or strong units, these data about textbooks are significant because they indicate that department members have a preference for breaking from the rigid routine of nightly textbook assignments and end-of-week quizzes, that they see themselves as course designers, and that they strive to provide their students with multiple perspectives on H./S.S. topics.

While it seems clear that the department members operate cooperatively, and share a range of academic values and practices, these are not the only criteria by which scholars have judged departmental strength. Ball and Bowe reported that:

> ... the pattern of problems and response [to the establishment of the British National Curriculum] varies between schools and departments ... [and] reflects the different *capacities, contingencies, commitments and histories* (emphasis in original) of these institutions.... [L]ow capacity, low commitment and no history of innovation results in a high degree of reliance on policy texts, external direction and advice.... Equally ... high capacity, high commitment and a history of innovation may provide a basis for a greater sense of autonomy and *writerliness* (emphasis in original) with regard to policy texts (Ball & Bowe, 1992, p. 112).

In Ball and Bowe's terms, both the "capacity" and the "commitments" of this department seem quite robust. The evidence indicates that teachers are well-educated and knowledgeable in their fields. The department's members share a commitment to the teaching of analytic and writing skills, employ a variety of teaching strategies, and draw upon sources beyond the textbook.

As it happens, however, the department's "history of innovation" – and innovation prospects – are more questionable. On the one hand, Caruso's rotation into the department Chairmanship was a departmental innovation. So were the establishment, years back, of a team-taught interdisciplinary Humanities course and an Advanced American Studies course for upperclassmen. One could assert that each of the "particularly strong" units described above is evidence of an individual teacher's innovative activity.

On the other hand, it's not clear how universal or how deep department members' commitment to hands-on, varied curriculum, or to the use of varied source material runs. The two newer teachers and one of the veterans strongly agreed with the survey statement that: "Teachers in this department regularly include activities like historical simulations, debates, and examinations of complex and/ or conflicting source material in their curriculum." The department Chair agreed also, though not strongly, saying: "I think everybody has fairly up to date strategies ... more in the 90's than say in the 50's and 60's." However, Caruso went on to acknowledge that "there's a wide variety of teaching," that "people in my department aren't as flexible in changing as they would like to think they are." Some of the older department veterans were having trouble shifting over to the varied teaching techniques advocated by the R.B.T. program. According to Caruso:

> [W]hat happened in the past is, a lot of teachers were sharing what they knew and not necessarily encouraging the kids to write better. Or organize better. Or, "Why did they do that?" They just shared, "This is what I know." And the issue there is, "Well, you've already earned your high school degree or college degree.... How are you going to help them become more skillful?"

In our interview, the Superintendent had made it clear that, for him, good curriculum was hands-on and interdisciplinary. Fein neither agreed nor disagreed with the survey statement. He commented that "we still have a lot of people that are more textbook-oriented than creative.... I want to see more of a balance of those." Springer disagreed with the survey statement, and asserted that, while she habitually made use of the varied teaching techniques listed in the statement, in her department, "It varies teacher to teacher.... There are teachers who ... plod along in the textbook.... And it's all at a certain consistent level of coverage, because you're on this mission to do it all." In her department, she said, "It's been okay to [teach in this way]."

These comments suggest that in the absence of external pressure, at least some of the teachers in this department would feel no compunction to improve their practice now, and might possibly never have come to emphasize the teaching of thinking and writing skills. Hence, it is unclear to what degree the department is *itself* a source of internal rejuvenation and improvement. Though their comments often indicated frustration with the administration and the external pressures for change, teachers talked extensively about the system's expectations in relation to Writing Across the Curriculum, and in relation to R.B.T. By contrast, nobody mentioned any recent departmental changes of an academic nature that had been internally initiated. To the extent that individuals have been changing their practice, all the data indicates that such changes have been instigated through the initiatives of district administrators. To be fair, due to Ball's "contingencies" (local circumstances), it may be that the department faculty has had no opportunity to initiate change internally. Between the administrative mandates and the new pressures from the state, teachers have had little time in recent years to initiate their own agenda.

Regardless of contingencies, however, the limited available data hint that the Chair of this department may himself be unlikely to act as a change-agent. He is first and foremost a colleague, strongly identifying himself as a teacher rather than as an administrator, for example by referring to administrators as 'they' and to his department members as 'we.' Educational sociologists long ago observed that teachers are uncomfortable with any actions or language among colleagues which establish inter-collegial hierarchy (Lortie, 1975). While it may be that teachers' enthusiastic comments about their Chair are a reflection of the professionally stimulating, collaborative and creative environment he has established in the department, we cannot overlook the obverse possibility that the comments are simply teachers' expressions of pleasure that, for once, they have a direct supervisor who makes no demands upon them. One interview interchange with Caruso was telling in this regard. Caruso explained that some of the faculty in his department had been teaching their favorite topics for years, and that by lingering on these topics, they failed to teach post-World War II history. He acknowledged that the state's new curriculum framework was forcing these teachers to teach up to the present, but he called this a "negative" development. I challenged him, in effect saying "why would that be negative? After all, it can't be a bad thing for students to get exposed to recent history?" True, Caruso acknowledged, it might be good for the students, but "It's negative in the sense that teachers are going to have to do more homework. They're going to have to be more prepared to teaching in this period of time...." If a Chair describes changes that are good for students but hard work for teachers as "negative," and if he views himself as a peer among colleagues, it seems fair to ask, first, whether he would be inclined to initiate or support changes which were in students' best interests but burdensome to teachers and, second, whether – if he were in fact in favor of such changes – he would be in a position to initiate or support their execution.

A Department in Transition

Through the 1997-8 school year, the Marwood department's course sequence was structured as follows:

A. 9th graders were required to take a one-year survey course called "Exploring Global Studies."

B. 10th graders were required to take "20th Century U.S. History."

C. Sometime during their Junior and Senior year, students were also required to take:

A. A one-semester Behavioral Science course (Options included both "Psychology" and "Sociology").

B. A one-semester course in "American Government."

All courses were taught at several hierarchically tracked levels. There were also a number of electives available to Juniors and Seniors: "A.P. Modern European History," "Issues – 60's to 90's," as well as the "Advanced American Studies" and "Humanities" courses mentioned earlier.

By the time that the state approved the H./S.S. curriculum framework in September of 1997, the members of the Marwood H./S.S. department had already been monitoring the state's activities around social studies for a year. According to Caruso, he and others had been attending various meetings trying to get some sense of "what they [the test-makers] actually gonna ask."

As soon as the H./S.S. framework was approved, then-Assistant Superintendent Fein established monthly two-hour meetings at which the H./S.S. leadership from all the district's schools gathered to discuss what would be entailed in aligning local curricula with the state's mandate. Fein set the agendas for these meetings. Caruso would return to his department from these district meetings, and then lead his department in its own meetings to discuss the issues raised at the district meetings. In the fall of 1998, looking back at the previous year, Caruso commented that "we [i.e. the department] have met an unbelievable amount of times."

In May 1998, the state administered M.C.A.S. tests in English, Math and Science, and a pilot test in H./S.S. Because Marwood's H./S.S. curriculum at that time did not yet include both 9th and 10th grade World History, the state prohibited M.H.S. from administering the H./S.S. pilot test.

In the summer of 1998, funded by the district, eight members of the department met for several days, to consider their options in response to the state mandate. The result of the workshop was a memo, outlining three possible four-year plans by which the department could gradually shift from its current curricular scope and sequence towards a new, more framework-aligned scope and sequence (See Appendix Four). All three options included one common feature: starting that fall, the 9th grade Global Studies course would be re-fashioned to more closely resemble the state's 9th grade Pre-Modern World History course.

In the fall of 1998, teachers of the 9th grade course began making a conscious effort to re-tailor their course to the state's mandate. The department and district-wide meetings took off right where they had left off, but the frequency increased along with the pressure to make decisions in time for the 1999 course catalogue.

During the 1997-8 school year and the summer afterwards, Fein came to several of the high school H./S.S. meeting. In the view of veterans Caruso and

Springer, at these meetings Fein emphasized ("Not suggested. Told.") the department that Marwood's course offerings should align with the state's new mandated curriculum so that students would be registering for an aligned scope and sequence for the 1999 school year. What would constitute an aligned scope and sequence was still an open question. According to Caruso, "basically, they came down [to our department] and said, you gotta get in line. Check the frameworks ... make sure that they're being taught.... They were panicking, in my opinion." Farmer, a newer teacher, understood Fein's message very differently, indeed.

> They've given us some direction that we need to be ... moving towards the test, but ... Dr. Fein ... indicated to us that he trusts our decision, he ... definitely didn't come in and say, 'you must completely align all of your courses to the frameworks.'

In his role as Chair, meanwhile, Caruso had been attending regular meetings of a "Regional Tech Collaborative," at which H./S.S. Chairpersons from throughout his part of the state regularly shared information about how their own districts and departments planned to respond to the curriculum framework and the prospect of M.C.A.S. Again, newcomer Farmer and veteran Springer had contrasting understandings of the information from other districts. Springer says of exposure to other departments' responses:

> It was important because most of the area schools are doing exactly what the state wants. You look at that and think, "Well what about us?" We are not [some elite enclave here]... where we can just say, "Look, our program is good, let's leave it the way it is," and have people accept that. That's not going to happen here in Marwood.

Farmer, by contrast, thought the department's membership were "reassured" by this information:

> What [we] noticed is that a lot of schools are not dropping all of their courses and completely realigning to the frameworks.... I don't think any two schools have come up with the same options or the same course selections. But a lot of them seem to be trying to preserve the status quo. Trying not to abandon electives, or even the sequence of the courses ...

These differences in perspective regarding both the degree of administrative pressure and the significance of changes taking place in nearby districts, raise questions: Is Farmer feeling freer and less pressured because she did not experience Marwood's earlier, authoritarian administrations? Do Springer and Caruso possess a wisdom borne of experience? They also illustrate that determining how to respond to the new state pressures has not been straightforward.

How the Members of the Marwood Department See the State Framework

Department members have strong views about the framework. Given the ideological debate over H./S.S. curricula around the country, I commenced my study hypothesizing that variations in teachers' curricular ideologies would influence their personal perspectives on the new framework. Therefore, I had designed interviews with the goal of identifying each teacher's stance regarding key H./S.S. curricular debates.

In part on the basis of this curricular ideology data, I have already argued that in very important respects, teachers in this department share educational values. They value the teaching of higher order thinking skills and writing; they prefer non-traditional H./S.S. teaching strategies, and employ resources beyond the textbook.

As a result, with one important exception, which I will explore at the end of this section, the Marwood faculty did not provide much opportunity to test my hypothesis. Teacher in this department tended to concur on a range of criticisms of the state's curriculum framework.

In Marwood, four of five department members could at least see some value in the state's curricular mandate. Smith thought it was positive that "there [was] going to be more of the core curriculum ... required of the kids." He was also cheered to think that the framework might "result in kids taking more social studies than they have in the past." Farmer "liked the fact that there's a desire to raise standards, [and] the goal, which is to get the students all on the same page." She thought the framework might be good for her honors students, because the standards would present a real challenge for them. Brodkey and Caruso both acknowledged that there was some value in asserting that all students should share some core knowledge by the time they graduate.

But the positive comments ended there. For four of five teachers in Marwood, one dominating concern about the curriculum framework outweighed all others. According to teachers, to use Ravitch's phrase (Ravitch, 1995, pp. 173-4), Massachusetts had promulgated an "encyclopedia" instead of focused standards. Springer called the framework's content requirements "huge," allowing that the framework "scares the life out of me," because it is "so content-specific and immense." Farmer warned, "The volume of it is just massive, and it does box us in." In teachers' view, a range of implications stemmed from this problem of volume.

First, Farmer and others worried that teaching the expansive content requirements of the framework would not leave time to teach skills: "how to read from the text, how to pull out information, how to put it in note form and in outline form…. If we … spend the time on those things … we won't be able to get all of the content in from the frameworks"

Second, Brodkey worried that the framework was "unrealistic for some students." So did Farmer:

> I'm not sure that all of the students are prepared to understand material to that degree…. I have Level Two … kids. Some of them have difficulty with reading, writing, comprehension skills. And I do have some concerns about how much of this material they're really going to be able to understand. And whether they'll be able to answer the questions on the test – even if we cover the material…. Not all the students are capable of being able to pace themselves on their own, doing outside work, outside research, outside reading. And that's what you'd need to get all the detail in…. They seem to be expecting college-educated students by the time they get out of high school.

In Marwood, the framework's extensive content requirements were creating a particularly piquant irony. Spurred on by the state's assertion that the new M.C.A.S. tests and frameworks in all disciplines would require students to demonstrate a higher level of academic knowledge and understanding, the district administration had just recently expended substantial resources, and had required the entire faculty to participate in R.B.T. R.B.T.'s message was that teachers should be varying their instructional strategies to meet the diverse needs and styles of their students, and that the emphasis should be on teaching for understanding. Yet, as Caruso observed, the framework, by creating pressure to cover a tremendous amount of content, seemed to fly in the face of the R.B.T. approach.

> What shocks us ... is that they're asking us to go back to the "good ole days..." [when] you had to deal with this topic, this topic. And it was on the board, y'know, chronological. "And these were the number of people that you should know. And this is what they did."

Thus, as Springer, Farmer, Brodkey and Caruso each warned, the third consequence of the framework's content-prescriptive overload was that the framework would prevent them from employing cooperative learning activities, simulations, research projects, and other time-consuming but engaging teaching strategies. "[T]he frameworks isn't going to allow you to be that flexible, debating and role-modeling and so forth."

Fourth, and finally, every member of the department expressed concerns that the sheer size and detail of the framework "don't..." as Farmer put it, "allow leeway." As one veteran put it, "They leave nothing to the imagination." To illustrate this point, Brodkey described a mini-unit he had recently taught, the likes of which he feared would no longer be possible under the state framework, to help his students make sense of the emerging crisis in Kosovo. "Is that part of the frameworks? No it's not."

Both Brodkey and Caruso were open to the idea of a state-mandated curricular core. However, as Brodkey put it, the mandate needed to be no more than a "small backbone" of material. Caruso went further, suggesting that the state should require no more than five or ten topics. As he put it, "What do you expect them to learn...? You gotta narrow it down.... I think they threw everything in there."

The teachers in Marwood made clear that they believe that their own, pre-M.C.A.S. curriculum is superior to the state's new mandate. One teacher's comment was representative (8). 'We have a great program. We worked hard to get it where it is. And now, the state comes along and we have to change what we're doing.'

The framework calls for three years of survey coursework (World History, in 9th and 10th grades, and U.S. History in the 11th). Faculty believed that so much survey would turn students off. Farmer complained that " ... everybody takes them in order to get through. They're ... just your run-of-the-mill courses, where ... everybody's sort of marching along with the same material." At one department meeting, Caruso recounted another Department Head's description of World History: "[He] describes their curriculum as "like a museum; and you drive your car through – and you look left and right, but you don't get out. He wasn't too fired up about it." At the same meeting, he asked who was interested in teaching a new, 10th grade World History course. A number of teachers began laughing, and then chanting "I want to teach World History, I want to teach World History!" Others simply shook their heads, smiling wryly.

From the perspective of department members, the framework is probably most threatening because alignment would require elimination of the department's existing program for upperclassmen. At one point, Farmer was reviewing a variety of responses to M.C.A.S. which were under consideration in her department. Tellingly, her assessment of each option was based entirely upon the degree of change to the electives and upper level requirements which that option would require. "These are courses where the kids do some really terrific things." One teacher's comment was representative (9): "We're losing a very popular elective program. Most popular in the high school. And more than that, our psychology and sociology requirements, requirements which the town had agreed were important for our kids."

Above, I mentioned that there was one important exception to the Marwood faculty's shared curricular ideology. Smith, unlike his interviewed colleagues, placed a greater premium upon teaching broad survey knowledge to underclassmen than upon exposing them to deeper units. Smith shared his colleagues' desire to protect the department's upper level program. He was not at all happy that the state was infringing upon local curricular control. But among his colleagues, he was the only one to reserve judgement on the state framework. This suggests that it will be worthwhile to further test my hypothesis – that teachers' individual curricular ideologies would influence their personal perspectives on the new framework – as I analyze the data from the other three H./S.S. departments included in the study.

Excepting Smith, the faculty in Marwood shared the view that the new state framework was putting them in a bind. Caruso put it most starkly: "We can't allow our kids to be tested, get embarrassed in the paper, because even though they suggest, y'know: 'Don't lose your own integrity ...' [A]t the same time, [they say] 'don't allow the kids to be tested and not prepared for it.'"

The Administration's Message

What do "they" – the administration – say about the curriculum framework? Superintendent Fein began our interview by declaring, "One of our [district-wide] academic goals is alignment with the Massachusetts curriculum frameworks. That is an absolute." Assistant Superintendent Davis called the establishment of clear statewide standards "long overdue," and during our one-hour interview three times reiterated that alignment with the framework was "very important." Fein said he was thrilled that the curriculum framework in H./S.S. had pressed the Marwood H./S.S. department to move towards an articulated, non-redundant, K-12 curriculum.

Fein compared the frameworks (in all subject areas) to a roadmap. They tell educators that the destination is New York City, but allow local districts to decide which route to take to get there. If faculty chose to teach material in a sequence that differed from the state's frameworks, Fein asserted, that would be okay, so long as Marwood students ultimately attained the state's benchmarks. The clear implication of this metaphor was that, while Fein was flexible about how they were achieved, in contrast to the teachers in the H./S.S. department, he accepted as given the appropriateness and value of the state's educational goals. Everyone must reach "New York."

However, both Fein and Davis also expressed reservations about the H./S.S. framework. Fein's reservations did not emerge until I probed; perhaps this is because his reservations pointed out contradictions in his own thinking and pointed up some of the problems associated with declaring alignment an "absolute" priority. For example:

1. Fein asserted that one of his priorities was to increase the pool of elective courses at the high school, but in our interview he never reconciled this priority with the fact that aligning with the state framework would necessarily force the H./S.S. department to cut electives.

2. Given teachers' comments about the over-stuffed nature of the framework, and his own declared expectation that everybody reach "New York," I wanted to know whether he thought teachers should teach all the H./S.S. topics. He then acknowledged that the H./S.S. framework was "tremendous; unbelievable," and went on:

> I would rather be certain that our kids are doing a good job learning and processing and synthesizing and giving us back the information that we did teach them, than to just be perfectly aligned and have done a superficial job. [If the curriculum framework] said you need to study all the factors of red, yellow and blue in the timeframe we have and our kids didn't know anything about the topic and it was difficult and we just did a little bit about red, yellow and blue, I guess I'm saying I would rather that they did a thorough job on red and yellow and then let me step up to the plate and say, "I want you all to know, we have not really studied blue...."

Fein thought he had made this message clear to the department, but acknowledged that "people are very nervous. They don't want to be caught saying that we didn't do this piece, we didn't do that piece." In our interview, Fein seemed nervous about this issue himself.

> I have to be very concerned ... that our kids are prepared to pass that test. Otherwise, where are we going to be, the end of 10th grade year, if we don't have kids who are passing the MCAS test in huge numbers? What am I supposed to do about that? It's going to be a very difficult situation.... I get up publicly as the

> Superintendent, I've got to be able to give a presentation or to say, "This is what we do" and to say that "Hey, our social studies department doesn't do a good job on Civil War. We only stop at Revolutionary." Well, people say: "Well then how the hell did everybody else in all the other districts do this?"

It seems reasonable to assume that Fein's own anxieties might have contributed to anxiety in the department about how, or whether, he would back up a decision to only cover selected content.

Davis delivered a fully developed critique of the H./S.S. framework without any probing. In his view, given the absence of a national consensus regarding what should be taught in H./S.S., the state had had a tough time developing H./S.S. standards and, ultimately, had approved a framework that was too broad and ill-focused. Thus, he acknowledged, it was going to be tough to cover all the required material within a "meaningful curriculum." On the other hand, he also acknowledged that the framework was narrow enough to have excised some worthwhile courses like psychology and sociology from the curriculum.

Despite his clear and concise critique of the framework, however, Davis's policy stance was a muddle. Acknowledging that the curriculum was too big to be taught well, he mused, "We'll focus on what we can." Moments later, though, he contradicted both himself and Fein's view that it was more important to do a few things well than to do everything superficially. "I don't know what it's going to require, but we have to cover the whole curriculum framework."

> Davis: You know what they're going to do with the test. Obviously, they're going to ... sample 25 [topics] this year and 40 next year.... By the

end ... they will have sampled all. So if your curriculum's going to be a valid curriculum, it's got to reflect all in the long run.

Landman: So you've got to figure out how to cover all these topics?

Davis: Exactly.

In interviews, these two administrators demonstrated an understanding of many, if not all, of H./S.S. teachers' concerns with the new curriculum framework. Department members did not recognize this, however. Caruso quipped, "They really don't know about the nuts and bolts of it.... [I]t's up to me to educate 'em on it;" Springer complained: "I have yet to really speak to an administrator ... who in the conversation about the curriculum mandates, impressed me that they really get it, [that] they really understand ... how it's going to exclude electives, all of the potential possibilities." In light of the contradictory expectations for the H./S.S. department which Fein and Davis articulated on the basis of their curricular understandings, and given teachers' feelings that, historically, their administrators have been out of touch, it is not surprising that teachers in the H./S.S. department believed the central administration did not understand the complex curricular issues. Certainly, administrators' mixed messages regarding expectations help to explain how Caruso and Springer could believe their administration was pushing for immediate alignment, when Farmer thought the department was being given broad discretion.

Contrasting perspectives on the M.C.A.S. Test

In spring 1999, the state administered its second M.C.A.S. H./S.S. test. This time, unlike 1998, when Marwood had been prohibited from administering the test, all districts in the state were required to participate. Scores will be returned to districts in fall, 1999.

The 1999 test was administered in three sessions, with a recommended length of forty-five minutes each. Each session included a combination of multiple choice and two 'open-response' questions. Students were provided with approximately half a page in which to write their answers to the open-ended questions. 80% of the test content consisted of "common questions," which appeared on all versions of the test. These questions (including all 'open-response' questions) were released to the public on September 21st, 1999. Of the thirty-three multiple choice questions released, 84% were focused on Western history (63% of the 9th and 10th grade topics in the framework deal with the West). Of the six 'open-response' questions, four focused on the West, and one focused on a non-Western society. These five open-response questions primarily required factual recall, while the sixth required students to demonstrate an understanding of economic concepts (Massachusetts Department of Education, 1999).

Teachers and administrators in Marwood shared concerns about how lower-level, and learning-disabled students would fare on M.C.A.S. Both groups were critical of the length of the M.C.A.S. tests, in general, and both expressed concern that by the end of the weeks of testing, students' motivation to continue doing schoolwork would be diminished. Teachers, like Davis, assumed that the state test would eventually sample all 258 sub-topics and therefore expressed anxiety that they would have to cover all of them in their World History course. "We have no idea, even ballpark, what kind of questions [will appear on next year's test]. It could be anywhere along the spectrum." They described going to great lengths – signing up to score tests over the summer; attending distant workshops with test-makers – to try to get a better sense of where the test-makers would place their emphasis.

Fein was the only one to mention that not all students do well with multiple choice, that the test was a poor assessment of the processes that students use in carrying out tasks. He was strongly critical of what he regarded as examples of sloppiness in 1998's test construction, including several faulty test questions which made their way into the Boston Globe (Daley, Hart, & Zernike, 1998; McNamara, 1998b).

However, overall, just as teachers were more critical of the H./S.S. curriculum framework than were administrators, they were also more critical of the pilot M.C.A.S. H./S.S. test. Notwithstanding his criticisms of the tests, the Superintendent's perspective on the test was extremely upbeat: "M.C.A.S. is one of the best things that ever happened to us.... It's accomplished something that we've worked very hard to accomplish: teachers talking to teachers about their practices." Davis was equally effusive: "I think it's the best source of information that I have ever seen in my career and I've been in this business 40 years." Davis praised the quality of information it provided about both individual students and overall district performance. Also, Davis asserted:

> It helps us to set direction in terms of our curriculum and... helps our teachers identify clearly where instruction needs to be improved. Some people may think that they are doing a wonderful job in instruction but if you look at the results of the MCAS tests there are certain things that come out that tell us that we've got to have a second look at the way we are instructing students.

Administrators' comments show that, even though they see the tests in their current form as flawed, they are confident that the tests will improve, and that working to improve test scores will ultimately be good for education in Marwood.

Caruso considered the test to be a rigorous assessment of students' writing skills; Smith thought it was "fair," because "the good students will do well. And… you can fill in the rest." Otherwise, H./S.S. teachers' comments were all critical. In addition to the concerns about the tests which they and administrators held in common, teachers also shared a host of frustrations about how the test's emphasis on content knowledge forced them to cover too much content, and to reduce attention to skills and analysis.

Several Marwood teachers urged the state to test a much smaller number of topics. Several voiced anxieties about the remedial steps the department would have to take with the students who failed the test. Smith complained that the test placed too much emphasis on Western civilization. The state was hiring people with Associates' degrees to score the tests. Four of the five teachers interviewed expressed suspicions that such individuals were insufficiently well-educated to assess the quality of students' writing. Moreover, teachers had heard that those hired by the state to score tests were required to score too many essays in too short a period of time. Given these two concerns, teachers feared that the scoring process was going to prove an invalid assessment of students' writing, analytic, and organizational skills.

The Department's Response to the Curriculum Framework and M.C.A.S.

When I began my data collection in the fall of 1998, interviewees' language already indicated the general trajectory of the department's response to the curriculum framework: i.e., department members felt they had no choice but to make curricular changes. The teachers of the 9th grade 'Global Studies' course were already reworking that course into 'World History I.' Caruso's use of the imperative, "have to," was typical: "we have to get the [new, aligned 10th grade] course."

The administration expected them to align. But independent of that, teachers worried about the consequences, for their students and for themselves, if their curriculum didn't prepare students to pass M.C.A.S. As Caruso put it, "[The state is] putting my career and my reputation on the line.... They're going to print the scores of Marwood High. We're basically a middle-class community. How do we match up against [the wealthier towns of] Wellesley? Weston? We don't."

The *open* question was, *what sort* of change would the department undertake? After all, teachers did not respect the state's curriculum, and they did not want to align. Caruso framed the problem:

> We don't want to give up too much of our hard-earned curriculum that we've worked so hard to put in place. And yet ... we have to match up to what the testing is going to be if our kids are going to take it.

Though they were never formally articulated to me as such, department members seemed to have developed two underlying goals: first, undertake at least enough change to ensure student success with the M.C.A.S. As Farmer put it, "We've got to ... at least [get] them to the point where they can be ready to take the test." Meanwhile, second, preserve the current scope and sequence for as long as, and to the greatest extent, possible. Caruso mused: "[I]f we happen to pull it off, that we can get away with 'World History One,' keep everything else.... If we get away with it, 'Good Luck! We pulled it off...!' That's what we would all like to see happen."

Gradually, as the fall of 1998 proceeded, in a series of participatory meetings, some of which I observed, the department came to consensus around a plan.

1. Starting in fall, 1999, the department's 9th grade Global Studies course would officially be replaced by World History One, a course completely aligned with the state's mandated 9th grade curriculum.
2. Teachers of the 10th grade U.S. History course were to try to incorporate more of the 20th century World History content into their courses, to help boost the M.C.A.S. scores of spring 1999's 10th graders.
3. In the fall of 1999, the department would review test scores from the previous May. If, on the basis of one year of World History, and a somewhat modified U.S. History curriculum, most Marwood H./S.S. students were getting passing M.C.A.S. scores, and those scores were close enough to scores in other comparable districts, they would ask the administration to allow them to leave their 10th through 12th grade course sequence untouched.
4. If test scores were not sufficiently high, they would then replace their current 10th grade U.S. History course with a 2nd year of World History, and move their U.S. History course to the junior year.

5. Decisions about what to do with the Behavioral Science and Government requirements, and about which year-long electives to cut to a semester and/or which to drop altogether, had not yet been broached. The department had been advocating for an increase in the H./S.S. requirements from three to three and a half or even four years, so that the government and or the behavioral science requirements might be preserved. Given the heavy requirements in other subject areas, it seemed unlikely that this request would be granted. Regardless, it was understood that in the context of a three year survey requirement, many students would not have room in their schedules to take more than one semester of H./S.S. electives.

   Nobody expected test scores to be high enough. Caruso predicted, "After the test, and after we see, 'did we prepare our students enough…?' I just can't imagine that it's going to come out that we did." Smith asserted that there was "no question" that the department would have to align further. In Springer's words, the department had "just bought a year."

Marwood's faculty articulated five explanations for why they had selected this plan.

A. None of the veterans in the department were volunteering to teach the new 10th grade World History course. Given rising enrollments and changing requirements, the department had been lobbying heavily for an additional teacher for the fall of 2000, and by the late fall they were fairly confident that the administration would provide them with the funds to make an additional hire. In addition, Caruso would be retiring. Thus, department members hoped to be able to hire two new teachers with specialized training in World History in time for fall 2000. Assuming that M.C.A.S. test scores were too low in 1999, the department would be better positioned to offer the World History course once the new staff was in place.

B. The Class of 2003 would be the first group whose diplomas would depend upon passing the M.C.A.S. test. These students would not be Sophomores until fall of 2000. Therefore, if 1999's Sophomores score low in social studies, Caruso asserted, "the risk is not that great for us." It would not be imperative for a "World History Two" course to be offered (and for scores to be raised) until 2000.

3. According to Davis, "material resources" for curricular alignment are "always available" to the department. "The budget contains money for textbooks.... Obviously, when new courses ... require new texts, new materials, that is provided." However, the department veterans (who had far more experience in Marwood than Davis) were highly skeptical. Springer observed that the middle school H./S.S. teachers were implementing a newly aligned curriculum

> ...and they were told that they ... might get 6 copies of one textbook, they might get 6 copies of another. So it wouldn't appear to be a full commitment financially, to allowing these people to do what it is they need to do. So then we're left to wonder....

As Caruso put it: "They're not going to give us the books. You are not going to go out and buy $15,000 worth of books. I haven't seen it happen yet, that they would generate that kind of finances in a short period of time." Putting off creation of the second World History course, department members hoped, would increase the chances that the district would have enough time to fully fund both the new 9th and the new 10th grade course.

4. At one point, Caruso rattled off what he described as an "overwhelming" laundry list of the framework-related issues his department was juggling (scheduling, curriculum planning, materials selection, etc.) As Farmer commented, "The more we look at it, the more headaches we get from it." Buying an additional year would give the faculty time to more methodically plan for the reorganization of the upper grade requirements and electives.
5. Because the issues to be addressed were so overwhelming Caruso also harbored his own rationale for moving slowly. He did not think highly of the administration's top-down management style. In his view, "Any change requires a certain degree of absorption." If the faculty were given time to digest the implications of low M.C.A.S. scores, and to think through their own plans, they would be more likely to take ownership of the end result. He claimed to have done a lot of legwork to persuade the administration to be patient.

> I'll say [to administrators], "Come on down to our meetings ... and listen to what [H./S.S. teachers] are talking about. The central administration says, "Well, we don't care what they think." I say, "Well, if you don't allow the people who are going to be instituting your changes ... to participate in the decision, you're not going to get much of an effort. They're going to sabotage you along the way." You know, we gotta go slow, we gotta take our time. And then you'll have a half-decent

> product.... Otherwise, you're going to be processing the same thing, shoveling the same pile of dirt.

The department members, themselves, offered the five explanations above for their choices. Based on the evidence, I see no reason to doubt that each of these explanations did, in fact, play a significant role in Marwood's determination of a course of action. In addition, however, it seems to me that by employing micro-political and other organizational lenses, the department's actions can be further contextualized and thus, better understood.

In her analysis, Siskin argues that the high school subject department acts politically – i.e. wields power – "in two critical ways: [the department] plays a primary role in the accumulation of resources (some departments get more than others) and then again in their allocation (some teachers get more from their departments)." She also points out that teachers are loath to acknowledge a colleague's or a department's political role or activity. "[T]eachers describe their own and their allies' decisions as non-political, and, rather, 'linked to the interests of the kids.'" In her study, the stronger the department, the better it is at providing advantages and resources to its members, the more likely it is to couch decisions in terms of how they will benefit students or the department as a whole, and the less likely it is to make decisions which foster inequities among department members (Siskin, 1994, pp. 115-7, 135). Thus, it is perhaps not surprising that Marwood teachers worked to improve their department's access to resources such as additional staff and materials, and in interviews rarely explained the actions they were taking in political terms. Given the department's strength, however, it is notable that, during the process of making decisions about how to respond to the state, two key actions stand out as having had darker political dimensions – i.e., they may well have been undertaken less to address students' needs and interests, and more to further the interests of the department's current members.

First, the department used the state mandate to press for an increase in the H./S.S. requirements at the high school. One possible explanation for this move is student-centered: though the state now required three years of survey courses, it is possible the H./S.S. department argued for increasing the H./S.S. requirements simply to ensure that students would continue to get exposure to what they considered to be the important ideas and skills taught in the behavioral science and government courses. The other explanations, however, are political. Increasing the requirements in H./S.S. would empower the department to hire new staff. This would enable department veterans to avoid responsibility for teaching World History, and allow them to continue to teach upper-level courses. As Caruso acknowledged, "They don't want to teach [the new World History courses].... [T]hey already have their package." At one department meeting, as response options were being discussed, the following interchange took place:

> Teacher 1: The first thing you need to decide is the numbers of people. Regardless of the curriculum, increasing enrollments mean there'll have to be additional staff!
>
> Teacher 2: If we're going to interpret the curriculum framework to hurt ourselves – we're crazy. [i.e., we would be crazy to ask only for sufficient additional staff to cover rising enrollments. The administration] are willing to go along with a three and a half year social studies requirement, because of the framework.

Teacher 3: It's sad that you have to think politics, but that's the reality.

This interchange about increasing requirements and making new hires took place concurrently, and in the midst of another discussion described earlier, in which teachers theatrically declined to volunteer to teach the new World History course. The implication was that increasing the H./S.S. requirements would enable current department members to take on fewer sections of World History. One of Springer's comments during this discussion strongly suggested that her motivations for increasing students' H./S.S. requirements had little to do with meeting students' educational needs.

> Why are we requiring government, psychology and sociology – when other [departments] aren't? We could just require that all students choose an elective in senior year. That would make my Advanced American Studies course a viable option.

Perhaps she believed that her course was more educationally valuable for students than the department's upper level requirements. Perhaps this comment was only a joke. Perhaps, however, the faculty's efforts to increase the H./S.S. requirements were motivated more by teachers' desires to protect their "packages," than by any underlying convictions about students' educational needs.

Second, the underlying motivation for delaying alignment may also have been political. By January 1999, approval of an additional hire for the department remained tentative, and the discussion about increasing the H./S.S. requirement had not moved ahead. As the increase in the H./S.S. requirement would have done, "buying a year" reduced the pressure upon veterans to teach the World History course. In effect, this delay enabled them to dump ten sections of World History on two new hires.

There are other, organizational lenses which also help to bring the department's actions into focus. Literature shows that many people find change threatening and unpleasant (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991; Sarason, 1996). For his part, Caruso believed that "people in my department aren't as flexible ... as they would like to think they are" and believed this so strongly that he pressured the administration to give his colleagues more time to adjust. Perhaps influenced by Caruso, Superintendent Fein believed that the faculty's resistance to alignment sprang from such a fear of change.

> [T]he [department] is ... somber. People have taught some of their subjects for years and they really are wedded to them and we might have ... to make some changes so our kids will be aligned better with the curriculum frameworks.

Springer, and Farmer, however, asserted that the department faculty was not afraid of change. Rather, they insisted, the teachers did not want to invest enormous energies and resources in a huge, overwhelming change that the faculty considered counterproductive. As Farmer put it:

> I don't see them looking from the point of view, of "Oh, jeez, we've got to rewrite everything, it's a bunch of work, it's a hassle." I think that there is an amount of satisfaction in the curriculum and there is frustration when you put together a work that you like and you think works. And now you have to adjust because someone outside is making you adjust.

Perhaps the department's choice of responses was in part selected because some individuals simply feared change. Intriguingly, it is possible that Caruso was so identified with his colleagues that, though he himself did not fear change, he was himself fostering resistance to alignment to protect his friends from unpleasant changes. The evidence that fear of change influenced the department's actions is inconclusive.

Ball observed that in Britain, stronger departments tended to exhibit a greater degree of "autonomy and writerliness" in response to the British National Curriculum, employing educational rationales to determine which elements of that curriculum they were going to implement and which they were going to ignore (Ball & Bowe, 1992). From the perspective of the larger organizational context, Marwood's response plan seems to be somewhat writerly – a compromise produced by a strong department, cognizant of what departments in other districts were doing, resisting to the extent possible a still stronger state mandate and a traditionally centralized district administration.

On the one hand, the department was "bonded," and was represented by a leader who was more identified with his colleagues than with the central administration. As a result of these characteristics – though he didn't believe he had and though it is possible that they arrived at this understanding on their own – Caruso seems to have successfully conveyed to district leadership the nature of his faculty's pedagogical and curricular concerns. After all, both Fein and Davis evidenced some comprehension of the educational critiques of the framework and test raised by the H./S.S. teachers. Caruso also seems to have won for his department the right to delay alignment. The administration had pressed for full alignment in 1999, and suspected that the department's resistance to alignment sprang in part out of fear of change, yet the department was being given until 2000.

On the other hand, the department was not in a position to simply ignore the state and the district. Springer observed that "[w]e don't have [the] kind of community support ... where we can just say, 'look, our program is good. Let's leave it the way it is,' and have people accept that. That's not going to happen here in Marwood." As a result of this vulnerability, though the administration understood the department's critiques of the state mandate, it did not convey unequivocal support for the department, if it chose not to cover chunks of the state curriculum. The response plan's ultimate trajectory is towards complete alignment with the state mandate. Moreover, the department had not yet exercised enough strength to win the expanded H./S.S. requirement.

Lastly, and in my view most importantly, the department's response plan must be understood at least in part as a principled response to flawed policy. As Caruso points out, and as the literature has long demonstrated, if teachers do not feel ownership of a policy, they will not implement it (Cohen, 1988; Elmore & McLaughlin, 1988). Smith adds that professionals often feel more accountable to their professional ethics than to the mandates of the political system (Smith, 1996, pp. 408-9). Every department member articulated educationally-grounded misgivings about the scope of the framework, about the M.C.A.S. test, and about their anticipated impact upon what department members considered to be an educationally sound local program. By stalling, the department members were putting off implementation of a curriculum that it did not respect.

There is an important caveat to this point, though. The department's response plan did little to ensure that Marwood's 9th and 10th graders would, to the extent possible, continue to get the type of education that the department's teachers most value – i.e., curriculum focused on skills, with hands-on investigative units. I heard no discussions about how to retain depth or build skills units within a world history curriculum. In this key respect, at least as of Spring 1999, the department's response had been remarkably un-"writerly" and un-principled. Is this a product of the department's weak "history of innovation?" Individually, department members spoke at length about their principled objections to the framework and test. But in my observations of the department's meetings, as options were weighed, discussions never seemed to focus on the needs of the students. Ultimately, if an underlying desire to do what was best for students guided the department's response to the state, nobody mentioned this rationale to me.

Drag or Enhancement?

Though some critics question whether systemic reform will ultimately foster much change in education, or whether teachers will implement changes that they do not "own," the high-stake M.C.A.S. test is clearly generating change in Marwood. The salient question is, will the reforms have a positive or negative impact upon education at Marwood High? Smith reported that in some Arizona communities, statewide standards led to curricular and instructional "drag," while in others, they enhanced local educational practices (Smith, 1996). Assessing whether Marwood's curriculum and pedagogy are being enhanced, degraded, neither, or both simultaneously, is problematic. Certain types of curricular change interpreted as 'drag' by one party, may be viewed as 'enhancement' by another.

To establish a credible, defensible framework for determining whether particular curricular or pedagogical changes in Marwood constitute "drag" or "enhancement," I undertook the systematic survey (described earlier in this paper, and also in greater detail, in Appendix One) of the most prominent, nationally-promulgated H./S.S. curricular documents crafted since *A Nation at Risk*. As I have already outlined, through this survey, I ascertained that, in the midst of debates over H./S.S. content and curriculum, there exists a national consensus regarding many of the characteristics of good H./S.S. curriculum and pedagogy and that the elements of this consensus, taken together, represent a vision of good H./S.S. education. To the extent that the Marwood H./S.S. department's curriculum and pedagogy are changing to more fully incorporate these characteristics – and thus are coming to resemble more closely that vision – I assert that H./S.S. education in Marwood is being "enhanced" by the new state framework and M.C.A.S. test. To the extent that curriculum and pedagogy in Marwood are coming to possess fewer of these positive characteristics, I assert that the department's curriculum and pedagogy are undergoing "drag." Where, regarding a key issue, no consensus exists among the national documents, I merely describe the direction of change taking place in Marwood and report any value judgements which Marwood teachers may have themselves ascribed to those changes. Table One, below, outlines findings from Marwood in relation to survey findings. Following Table One, findings outlined in column three – areas of curricular drag and enhancement in Marwood – are explored in detail.

Table One*

Curricular Issue	Is there an affirmative national consensus on this point?	Is Marwood's H./S.S. department experiencing or anticipating drag, enhancement, or change in a particular direction, along this curricular/pedagogical dimension?
Should curriculum be articulated, K-12?	yes	enhancement
Should students take H./S.S. for most of the years between K and 12, including not less than three years from 9-12?	yes	small possibility of enhancement. Even if requirements are not increased, however, Marwood will retain what the national documents would consider to be a reasonable set of high school H./S.S. requirements.
Should all students be exposed to a common core of knowledge and skills?	yes	Marwood's core is changing, but not necessarily expanding or improving
Should that core contain a balance of western and non-western, canonical and non-canonical material?	yes	don't know
Should the curriculum leave room for deep topical exploration?	yes	drag
Should the curriculum leave room for flexibility and discretion on the part of local districts and individual teachers?	yes	drag
Should higher-order thinking skills be emphasized in the curriculum?	yes	drag
Should pedagogy include varied, hands-on teaching strategies?	yes	drag
Should varied teaching materials, presenting multiple perspectives on topics/issues be employed?	yes	no change
Should students be encouraged to construct their own meaning and interpretation of the topics and issues studied?	yes	no change
Should the curriculum be built around a particular disciplinary core?	no	Marwood's core is becoming more historical
Should the high school H./S.S. scope and sequence be dominated by 'core' knowledge survey courses, and limit students to one year or less of electives?	no	Marwood fears the diminution of its elective program and elimination of its requirements for upperclassmen.
Should all students be exposed to a similar, high-challenge, content-rich curriculum as a way of increasing educational equity?	no	No change
Should more emphasis be placed on recent, more "relevant" H./S.S. content?	no	Teachers are experiencing pressure to include more recent content in their curriculum
Should students be expected to participate in their community or polity as a part of their H./S.S. education?	no	don't know
Should students' writing be a special focus of H./S.S. curriculum and pedagogy?	no	Marwood teachers are devoting less time to writing and research than previously.

* Table One sources are cited in Appendix One.

Certainly, the state's policies are generating some positive effects in Marwood. The first and most clearly positive effect, however, has almost nothing to do with the *high school* H./S.S. department. The new framework is forcing Marwood towards a more articulated sequence of content knowledge standards. Because of the framework and M.C.A.S., Marwood's elementary and middle school H./S.S. teachers are for the first time developing an articulated and less redundant curriculum leading logically to the high school course sequence. The national curricular documents agree on the importance of curricular articulation. This is the sort of top-down systematization that reformers have envisioned (American Federation of Teachers, 1996b; National Education Summit, 1996). Though most teachers at Marwood High gave this point little attention (perhaps because the high school curriculum, itself, had long been articulated), the district administrators and Smith each emphasized that the pressure applied by the state framework and test was for the first time guaranteeing that all students would be exposed to a common core of important historical knowledge.

Second, the newly uniform statewide curriculum is generating a sizeable market for new textbooks and other curricular materials. This appears to be leading to the production of high quality resources aligned to the new framework. There is national consensus that H./S.S. teaching should employ varied, high-quality resources presenting multiple perspectives on topics and issues. As part of the curriculum development process at Marwood high school, teachers were reviewing textbook supplements and learning kit options for the new World History courses. Caruso and Fein both thought that some of these new teaching materials were of exceptional quality, and would foster exciting teaching. Ironically, however, Caruso questioned "whether people are going to buy into it now, with the testing...." Given the coverage pressures, would teachers take the time to use these new materials to their full potential? Also, as of spring 1999, the question of sufficient funding for these materials remained open.

Likewise, third, the department was investing some time and energy in collection of primary source materials for classroom use. According to Farmer, "instead of talking about the American Revolution or the French Revolution, [students are supposed to be] reading the *Declaration of Rights Of Man*. So, the emphasis [in the framework] is on knowing what you are talking about, you know, as opposed to just knowing the 'identifications.'" Given that teachers in this department were accustomed to using an array of supplementary materials in addition to, or sometimes instead of, textbooks, it would be hard to say whether this was a positive development, but it does at least suggest the absence of drag.

Fourth, the department had not yet definitively lost its campaign to expand student H./S.S. requirements, a direction which all of the national documents promote. In late spring 1999, Davis acknowledged that success on the H./S.S. M.C.A.S., and retention of the elective program might yet "require more emphasis in terms of amount of time we spend in the area of H/S.S. We may have to do that."

Finally, and related to the fourth point, there was the prospect of increased district investment in H./S.S.

1. The district was providing substantial resources to the department, for a lengthy 1999 summer workshop focused on crafting the new World History courses.
2. While department members remained skeptical about how quickly the materials would actually appear, administrators at least asserted that they would be providing the department with new textbooks and materials.
3. The department was almost certainly going to be adding a new position.

It is hard to know whether, absent the state mandate, the department could have anticipated a similar level of district investment, but it seems clear that the state mandate made it impossible to do much less. While the national documents do not directly promote increased expenditures on H./S.S. education, it seems safe to describe increased funding as an educational enhancement.

The framework's emphasis upon recent World and American history was pressing teachers to include recent history in their content coverage. While Caruso was unenthusiastic about having to pressure his faculty to drop favorite old units and to prepare to teach the more contemporary material, he agreed with me that doing so was probably in students' educational interests. However, there is no consensus among the national curricular documents regarding whether it is preferable to emphasize "relevant" content over other material.

Despite these positive effects of the state's policies, however, teachers' assessments of the upcoming changes to their curriculum and pedagogy suggest that the impact of the framework and test has been, and is going to be, predominantly negative.

While the state framework is "non-redundant and articulated," they considered it to be over-stuffed and ill-focused. They feared many students would be unable to keep up with the punishing pace of content coverage. In their view, its content requirements were insufficiently flexible, and they feared those requirements would deprive them of professional discretion necessary to creatively respond to student interests and needs. They claimed the framework left them no room to change course or digress at teachable moments.

Whatever benefits might accrue by guaranteeing sequential content coverage, teachers emphasized how the pressures to cover content would reduce time available for attention to "higher order" skills like organization, writing and analysis. The M.C.A.S. test does not assess students' research skills or their capacity to analyze complex historical issues. At one meeting, department members discussed eliminating a 9th grade research paper from the curriculum. In our interview, Smith had called this research assignment one of his best units. The impetus for the department discussion was that the paper took too much time away from M.C.A.S. content coverage. As Madaus and Kellaghan have warned, the "skill and knowledge not examined" may be dropped from the curriculum (1992, p. 90).

Teachers also anticipated that teaching to the framework would reduce or eliminate opportunities to teach the kinds of deep, complex, hands-on, exploratory units which they considered to be their best work, and would pressure teachers to rely on teacher-led chalk-and-talk instruction rather than the varied strategies encouraged by the R.B.T. program. In every one of these respects, the state's policies seem to be pushing Marwood H./S.S. education away from the national, consensus vision of good H./S.S. pedagogy and curriculum.

No national consensus exists regarding the appropriate balance between required, core-content survey courses, and elective course options for high school students. However, teachers in this department felt the state was requiring too much dull survey coursework – another assault on variety – and by doing so was threatening to destroy their more interesting local program of electives and upper-level requirements. This move towards survey courses also entailed placing the discipline of history far more at the center of the department's curriculum. Where previously the department had required an inter-disciplinary "Exploring Global Studies" course, as well as "American Government" and "Behavioral Science," the department was now moving towards a three-year history requirement. The national documents disagree about whether a move to a disciplinary core is positive or not, and the department's faculty neither welcomed nor regretted this change.

Thus, there is ample evidence that – just as the literature warns – the state is moving towards over-control of the complex domain of the classroom, with unintended, undesirable consequences. None of the teachers' fears had yet been fully realized. On balance, however, these anticipated negative developments far outweighed the positive influences of the new state policies. While the state was successfully moving Marwood's K-12 curriculum towards logical articulation, and while state policies were generating some high-quality resources, the framework and test were simultaneously threatening to undercut teachers' flexibility to respond to their students' needs, threatening to undermine Marwood teachers' focus on higher-order skills, and making it difficult for department members to provide the varied, active, deeper learning experiences which they (and the national texts) value.

At the same time, the department also found itself focusing on test-taking skills. In Davis' view, it was appropriate and positive for departments to examine "the way questions are worded and phrased" and to coach students in how to respond to negative multiple choice or open-response style questions. At one department meeting, I observed as faculty weighed the acceptability and value of strategies to raise test scores: coaching students who asked questions during the test; sharing information about test questions; giving students opportunities to practice open-response questions. Koretz has observed that not all "teaching to the test" is bad. As an example, he suggests that if test scores have indicated that students have weak skills in long-division, it is appropriate to invest time in teaching long-division prior to the next round of tests. However, Koretz also points out that if teachers "increase the attention they devote to the content of a given test, without a corresponding increase in the attention they give to other components of the [knowledge/subject-area] domain in question," they are merely inflating test scores rather than increasing students' understanding (Koretz, 1988, p. 47). While there may be some broader value in exposing students to open-response questions, attending to the wording of questions and sharing information regarding test question content (while understandable in a high-stakes context) are practices which must be recognized for what they are: time invested in skills and knowledge the only value of which is to raise students' test scores.

The Need For Further Study

Marwood is one of four sites included in a larger study. While it is possible that taken alone, this case may be of use to policymakers, much of the real-world policy value of the findings reported here will emerge from a cross-case analysis. The state's policies are causing curricular drag in Marwood. Is this the case elsewhere? In an educationally weak department, however, might the state's framework and test – even if they do promote superficial curriculum – be a source of enhancement rather than drag? If there are such variations in the qualitative impact of the state's policies in different settings, what might be the policy implications?

Teachers in Marwood articulate a range of substantive problems with the current framework and test. The Marwood data suggests that individual teachers' curricular ideologies influenced their responses to these policies. Do teachers across varied contexts, and with differing curricular ideologies share the views of teachers in Marwood? If so, there would be policy implications. If teachers in varied settings, with differing ideologies disagree about the strengths and weaknesses of the policies, what might the significance of such findings be?

In Marwood, state policies fostered a moderate degree of departmental resistance. Would different departmental contexts result in different responses? In weaker departments, might individual teachers' responses be more differentiated? What can policymakers learn from contextually-grounded variations in departmental and teacher responses to their policies?

In Marwood, the differences between administrators' and teachers' perceptions of the framework and test were numerous and substantive. Are there similar differences between administrators and teachers in other districts? Are other departments using the new state mandate to leverage resources? Do teachers' (rather than students') best interests seem to be driving such activities? The Marwood H./S.S. department's response seemed to be influenced in part by teachers' knowledge of other districts' actions. If such patterns turn up across varied settings, can we gain some understanding of the causes? What might be the policy implications of such patterns?

Along many dimensions, cross-case comparisons promise insight into the complexities of policy-making in an ideologically-contested curricular arena.

Conclusions

The Marwood High School H./S.S. department is a "bonded" department. The internally-selected Department Head was praised by his colleagues for being exceptionally supportive, and for fostering collaborative, professional relationships within the department. Faculty view their department as collegial, and describe their departmental peers as engaged, knowledgeable professionals who set high standards for students. They share a commitment to the teaching of writing and analysis. While interviewed faculty described some of their colleagues as more textbook-dependent and less creative, all of the interviewed faculty, at least, valued hands-on, deep, varied, controversy-engaging curriculum. One serious question is whether the current Department Chair could or would, himself, act as a change-agent, even for changes that were educationally warranted.

Historically, relations between the administration and the department had been top-down, and teachers had viewed their administrators unfavorably. In recent years, the administration had introduced initiatives that, at least in some teachers' classrooms, had pressured teachers to increase the emphasis on writing, and had increased teachers' use of varied teaching strategies. Some teachers had resented the top-down nature of the initiatives. Nonetheless, teachers were hopeful that the new Superintendent, who had been involved in these initiatives, would be to their liking.

From the time that the state began development of the H./S.S. curriculum framework, the department has been monitoring state activity. In part, this is because, from the outset, district leaders have been focusing their attentions on responding to the new state policies.

District administrators feel the pressure to demonstrate success on M.C.A.S. On the other hand, they understand that the H./S.S. framework and test are flawed. Partly as a result of this tension, they may have been sending mixed messages to the H./S.S. department. Certainly, department members believe that administrators don't understand the problems created by the state policies; teachers disagree about what the district expects of them. Regardless of the district administration's expectations, however, because of the high stakes associated with M.C.A.S, teachers themselves have felt tremendous pressure to focus on preparing students for test success. It's quite possible that even if the district administration had placed no pressure upon the department, the department would on its own have felt obliged to make curricular changes.

This sense, that they must align with the state framework in order to protect their students and themselves, weighs heavily upon the Marwood faculty, for they have an overwhelmingly negative opinion of both the framework and the test based upon it. The tension between this strong department's members' desire to retain their current curriculum and the perceived need to respond to a powerful state mandate represents the heart of the Marwood case.

Thus far, the department's response has been to put off alignment with the state framework for as long as possible, and to the greatest extent possible. The sources of this response are complex – a combination of pragmatic and political calculations, possibly a fear of change, and principled educational objections to the state mandate. Ultimately, though, it seems likely that if the H./S.S. M.C.A.S. test remains a high-stakes exam, all of the organizational, contextual factors are going to prove inconsequential. The department will be forced into complete alignment.

Such an outcome would be disheartening indeed. The data demonstrates emphatically that alignment will entail curricular drag. The state, in the process of systematizing the K-12 content sequence and establishing some baseline accountability regarding content coverage and the teaching of rudimentary writing skills, will be forcing the faculty in Marwood to relinquish excellent elements of their program. These elements – recognized by all the national bodies that have attempted to define the qualities of good H./S.S. education – include attention to students' diverse learning needs and interests, and to their organizational, writing and analytic skills; deep, complex units grounded in a diversity of materials; and teaching strategies which are varied and engaging.

The National Academy of Education has urged that standards "should not be an exhaustive… compendium of every group's desired content" and that "it should … be possible to teach them effectively within the constraints of the normal school day and year." (McLaughlin & Shepard, 1995, p. xviii) The Council for Basic Education, and the American Federation of Teachers have urged similar restraint in the crafting of standards (American Federation of Teachers, 1996a; Pritchard, 1996). Drawing upon the data set generated by the

Third International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS), Achieve, Inc. has reported that compared to American states,

> Instruction in the top-achieving countries is focused on a smaller number of topics at a time and these topics are treated thoroughly, until they are mastered, rather than covering a lot of topics at each grade level and teaching them only partially.... The curricula used in American schools seem to be particularly weak in this respect (Achieve Incorporated, 1999; Valverde & Schmidt, 1997).

In effect, if Marwood is any indicator, the combination of the Massachusetts H./S.S. framework and the testing strategy employed by the D.O.E. appears to be pushing for this "weaker" kind of instruction – superficial, rather than substantive.

References

Achieve Incorporated. (1999). Benchmarking to the best: Achieve's proposal for an internationally benchmarked mathematics achievement partnership : unpublished.

American Federation of Teachers. (1996a). Setting strong standards: AFT's criteria for judging the quality and usefulness of student achievement standards (175). Washington, D.C.: American Federation of Teachers.

American Federation of Teachers. (1996b). A system of high standards: What we mean and why we need it (234). Washington, D.C.: AFT.

Archbald, D. A., & Porter, A. C. (1994). Curriculum control and teachers' perception of autonomy and satisfaction. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 16(1), 21-39.

Ball, S. J., & Bowe, R. (1992). Subject departments and the implementation of National Curriculum policy: An overview of the issues. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 24(2), 97-115.

Ball, S. J., & Lacey, C. (1995). Revisiting subject disciplines as the opportunity for group action: A measured critique of subject subcultures. In L. S. Siskin & J. W. Little (Eds.), The subject in question: Departmental organization and the comprehensive high school . N.Y.: Teachers' College Press.

Benveniste, G. (1987). Professionalizing the organization: Reducing bureaucracy to enhance effectiveness. S.F., CA.: Jossey-Bass.

Borenstein, D. (1998, July 11, 1998). Letter to the editor: state's policies undo an inspiring teacher. Boston Globe.

Bowe, R., Ball, S. J., & Gold, A. (1992). Reforming education and changing schools: Case studies in policy sociology. London: Routledge.

Bradley Commission on History in Schools. (1989). Building a history curriculum: Guidelines for teaching history in schools. In P. Gagnon & Bradley Commission on History in Schools (Eds.), Historical literacy: The case for history in American education (pp. 16-47). N.Y., N.Y.: Macmillan Publishing Company.

California State Board of Education. (1987). History-social science framework for California public schools, kindergarten through grade twelve . Sacramento, CA.: California State Department of Education.

Center for Civic Education. (1994). National standards for civics and government . Calabasas, CA.: Center for Civic Education.

Cohen, D. (1995). What standards for national standards? Phi Delta Kappan(June), 751-757.

Cohen, D. K. (1988). Teaching practice: Plus que ça change... In P. W. Jackson (Ed.), Contributing to educational change (pp. 27-84). Berkeley, CA.: McCrutcham Publishing Corporation.

Cornbleth, C., & Waugh, D. (1995). The great speckled bird: Multicultural politics and education policymaking. N.Y., N.Y.: St. Martin's Press.

Council of Chief State School Officers. (1994). Geography framework for the 1994 National Assessment of Educational Progress (RN 91073001). Washington D.C.: National Assessment Governing Board.

Council of Chief State School Officers, American Historical Association, American Institutes for Research, National Council for History Education, & Studies, N. C. f. t. S. (1994). U.S. history framework for the 1994 National Assessment of Educational Progress (RN 91072001). Washington, D.C.: National Assessment Governing Board.

Council of Chief State School Officers, Center for Civic Education, & Research, A. I. f. (1998). Civics framework for the 1998 National Assessment of Educational Progress (ZA 95001001). Washington, D.C.: National Assessment Governing Board.

Daley, B. (1999, 9/28). Board adopts MCAS-based school policy. Boston Globe, pp. B1, 4.

Daley, B., Hart, J., & Zernike, K. (1998, Dec. 8). State test doesn't measure up, say 3 Boston Latin teachers. Boston Globe, pp. B2.

Darling-Hammond, L., Chajet, L., & Robertson, P. (1996). Restructuring schools for high performance. In S. H. Fuhrman & J. A. O'Day (Eds.), Rewards and reform: Creating educational incentives that work (pp. 144-192). S.F., CA.: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Eisner, E. (1995). Standards for American schools: Help or hindrance? Phi Delta Kappan(Fall), 758-764.

Elmore, R. F. (1983). Complexity and control: What legislators and administrators can do about implementing public policy. In L. S. Shulman & G. Sykes (Eds.), Handbook of teaching and policy (pp. 318-369). N.Y.: Longman.

Elmore, R. F., & McLaughlin, M. W. (1988). Steady work: Policy, practice and the reform of American education (R-3574-NIE/RC). Santa Monica, CA.: RAND Corporation, prepared for the National Institute of Education.

Engle, S. H. (1993). Foreword. In R. W. Evans & D. W. Saxe (Eds.), Handbook on teaching social issues (pp. v-viii). Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies.

Evans, R. W., & Brodkey, J. (1996). An issues-centered curriculum for high school social studies. In R. W. Evans & D. W. Saxe (Eds.), Handbook on teaching social issues (pp. 254-264). Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies.

Evans, R. W., Newmann, F. M., & Saxe, D. W. (1996). Defining issues-centered education. In R. W. Evans & D. W. Saxe (Eds.), Handbook on teaching social issues (pp. 2-5). Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies.

Floden, R., Porter, A., Alford, L., Freeman, D., Irwin, S., Schmidt, W., & Schwille, J. (1988). Instructional leadership at the district level: A closer look at autonomy and control. Educational Administration Quarterly, 96-124.

French, D. (1998). The state's role in shaping a progressive vision of public education. Phi Delta Kappan(November), 185-194.

Fullan, M. G., & Stiegelbauer, S. (1991). The new meaning of educational change. (2nd ed.). N.Y.: Teacher's College Press; Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Gagnon, P. (1988, November). Why study history? Atlantic Monthly, 262, 43-47,50-57, 60-66.

Geller, H. A., & Johnston, A. P. (1990). Policy as linear and nonlinear science. Journal of Education Policy, 5(1), 49-65.

Geography Education Standards Project. (1994). Geography for life: National geography standards, 1994 . Washington, D.C.: Geography Education Standards Project.

Hahn, C. L. (1996). Research on issues-centered social studies. In R. W. Evans & D. W. Saxe (Eds.), Handbook on teaching social issues (pp. 24-41). Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies.

Hirsch, E. D., Jr. (1984). Cultural literacy: What every American needs to know. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Howe, P. J. (1998, 12/10/98). On Beacon Hill, exam results met with resolve, not surprise. Boston Globe, pp. B10.

Koretz, D. (1988). Arriving in Lake Wobegon: Are standardized tests exaggerating achievement and distorting instruction? American Educator, 12(2), 8-15.

Lewis, A. (1995). An overview of the standards movement. Phi Delta Kappan(June), 745-769.

Lortie, D. (1975). School teacher. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Madaus, G. F., & Kellaghan, T. (1992). A national test or testing system: issues for the social studies community. (Special Section: Student assessment in Social Studies). Social Education, 56(2), 89-91.

Massachusetts Department of Education. (1985). A new classification scheme for communities in Massachusetts . Malden, MA.

Massachusetts Department of Education. (1997). History and social science curriculum framework . Malden, MA.: Department of Education.

Massachusetts Department of Education. (1998). Massachusetts Department of Education: School and district profiles. [Online]. Available website: http://info.doe.mass.edu/pic.www//the-rest.htm [Access date: 9/16/1998] .

Massachusetts Department of Education. (1999). The Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System: Release of spring 1999 test items. [Online]. Available URL: http://www.doe.mass.edu/mcas/Spring99Items/g10hist.pdf [Access date: 9/22/99]. .

Massachusetts State Legislature. (1993). Education Reform Act of 1993, Chapter 71, Commonwealth of Massachusetts General Laws . Boston, MA.: Massachusetts Department of Education.

Massialas, B. G. (1996). Criteria for issues-centered content selection, NCSS Bulletin (pp. 44-50). Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies.

McDonald, J. (1992). Teaching: Making sense of an uncertain craft. N.Y.: Teachers College Press.

McLaughlin, M., & Shepard, L. A. (1995). Improving education through standards-based reform: A report by the National Academy of Education Panel on Standards-Based Education Reform . Stanford, CA.: National Academy of Education.

McLaughlin, M. W. (1987). Learning from experience: Lessons from policy implementation. Education Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 9(2), pp. 171-178.

McNamara, E. (1998a, 7/4). The daily test of teaching. Boston Globe, pp. B1.

McNamara, E. (1998b, 5/27). Overdue homework. Boston Globe, pp. B1.

Meier, D., & Kohn, A. (1998,). The debate over the MCAS test: It's difficult and destructive. Boston Globe, pp. ?

Mohrman, S. A., & Lawler, E. E. (1996). Motivation for school reform. In S. H. Fuhrman & J. A. O'Day (Eds.), Rewards and reform: Creating educational incentives that work (pp. 115-143). San Francisco, CA.: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Nash, G. B., Crabtree, C., & Dunn, R. E. (1997). History on trial: Culture wars and the teaching of the past. N.Y., N.Y.: Alfred A. Knopf.

National Center for HIstory in the Schools. (1992). Lessons from history: Essential understandings and historical perspectives students should acquire. Los Angeles: National Center for History in the Schools, U.C.L.A.

National Center for History in the Schools. (1994). National standards for world history: Exploring paths to the present (grade 5-12 expanded edition, including examples of student achievement). Los Angeles: National Center for History in the Schools, U.C.L.A.

National Center for History in the Schools. (1997). National standard for United States history: Exploring the American experience (Grades 5 -12, expanded edition including examples of student achievement). Los Angeles: National Center for History in the Schools.

National Commission on Social Studies in the Schools Curriculum Task Force. (1989). Charting a course: Social studies for the 21st century . Washington, D.C.: The National Commission on Social Studies in the Schools,
Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching,
National Council for the Social Studies, &
Organization of American Historians.

National Commisssion on Excellence in Education. (1983). A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform . Washington, D.C.: Government Publications Office.

National Education Summit. (1996). Governors, Business Leaders Pledge Swift Action: Excerpts from the [governors'] policy statement adopted at the National Education Summit. American Educator, 20, 13-15.

Nelson, J. L. (1996). The historical imperative for issues-centered education. In R. W. Evans & D. W. Saxe (Eds.), Handbook on teaching social issues (pp. 14-24). Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies.

O'Day, J. A. (1996). Introduction: Incentives and school improvement. In S. H. Fuhrman & J. A. O'Day (Eds.), Rewards and reform: Creating educational incentives that work (pp. 1-16). San Francisco, CA.: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Ochoa-Becker, A. (1996a). Building a rationale for issues-centered education. In R. W. Evans & D. W. Saxe (Eds.), Handbook on teaching social issues (pp. 6-14). Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies.

Ochoa-Becker, A. (1996b). Part one: Definition & rationale. In R. W. Evans & D. W. Saxe (Eds.), Handbook on teaching social issues (pp. 1). Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies.

Parson, G. (1998). All that stands in their way: History wars, politics and democratic education in Massachusetts : teaching case study, in preparation, Harvard Graduate School of Education.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). Qualitative research and evaluation. (Second Edition ed.). Newbury Park, CA.: Sage Publications, Inc.

Porter, A. C., Smithson, J., & Osthoff, E. (1994). Standard setting as a strategy for upgrading high school mathematics and science. In R. F. Elmore & S. H. Fuhrman (Eds.), The governance of curriculum: 1994 yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (pp. 138-166). Alexandria, VA.: ASCD.

Powell, A. (1996). Motivating students to learn: An American dilemma. In S. H. Fuhrman & J. A. O'Day (Eds.), Rewards and reform: Creating educational incentives that work (pp. 17-59). S.F., CA.: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Pressman, J. L., & Wildavsky, A. (1979). Implementation: How great expectations in Washington are dashed in Oakland; Or, why it's amazing that federal programs work at all, this being a saga of the economic development administration as told by two sympatheitc observers who seek to build morals on a foundation of ruined hopes. (Second ed.). Berkeley, CA.: University of CA. Press.

Pritchard, I. (1996). Judging standards in standards-based reform. Perspective, 8(#1).

Ravitch, D. (1995). National Standards in American Education. Wash., D.C.: Brookings Institution.

Reville, S. P. (1999, 9/16). One thing Massachusetts has yet to test: Education reform itself. Boston Globe, pp. A19.

Ross, W. E. (1996). Diverting democracy: The curriculum standards movement and social studies education. International Journal of Social Education, 11(1), 18-39.

Sarason, S. B. (1996). Revisiting "The culture of the school and the problem of change". N.Y., N.Y.: Teachers' College Press.

Saunders, P., Calderwood, J., & Hansen, L. (1984). A framework for teaching the basic concepts: Master curriculum guide in economics (2nd edition) (JCEE Checklist no. 335). Washington, D.C. (?): Joint Council on Economic Education.

Schlesinger, A. M. J. (1992). Disuniting of America: Reflections on a multicultural society. N.Y., N.Y.: W.W. Norton & Co.

Scott, W. R., & Cohen, R. C. (1995). Work units in organizations: Ransacking the literature. In L. S. Siskin & J. W. Little (Eds.), The subject in question: Departmental organization in the high school (pp. 48-67). N.Y., N.Y.: Teachers' College Press.

Sills, J. (1999). [Feb.19] E-mail written by the chair of the social studies department at Brookline High School (to State Representative Alice Wolf) ... in response to her request for information on the impact of the social studies MCAS on the ability to teach in depth. *Assessment Reform Network Mailing List* [Online]. Available E-mail: RobRiordan@bpic.org *or* ARN-L@LISTS.CUA.EDU [Access date: Feb. 23, 1999]. .

Sirotnik, K. A. (1998). What goes on in classrooms? Is this the way we want it to be? In L. Beyer & M. W. Apple (Eds.), The curriculum: Problems, politics, and possibilities (Second ed., pp. 58-72). N.Y.: S.U.N.Y. Press.

Siskin, L. S. (1994). Realms of knowledge: Academic departments in secondary schools. London: Falmer Press.

Sizer, T., & Rogers, B. (1993). Designing standards: Achieving the delicate balance. Educational Leadership, 5(February), 24-26.

Smith, M. L. (1996). Reforming schools by reforming assessment: Consequences of the Arizona student assessment program . L.A., CA.: NCRESST/ CSE Technical Reports.

Stevenson, D., & Baker, D. (1991). State control of the curriculum and classroom instruction. Sociology of Education, 64(1), 1-10.

Stodolsky, S. S., & Grossman, P. L. (1995). The impact of subject matter on curricular activity: An analysis of five academic subjects. American Educational Research Journal, 32(2), 227-249.

Talbert, J. E. (1995). Boundaries of teachers' professional communities in U.S. high schools: Power and precariousness of the subject department. In L. S. Siskin & J. W. Little (Eds.), The subject in question: departmental organization and the high school (pp. 68-94). N.Y.: Teachers' College Press.

Talbert, J. E., McLaughlin, M. W., & Rowan, B. (1993). Understanding context effects on secondary school teaching. Teachers College Record, 95(1, Fall), 45-68.

Tyack, D., & Cuban, L. (1995). Tinkering toward utopia: A century of public school reform. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press.

U.S. Congress. (1995). Congressional Record: Senatorial debate over U.S. history standards (Vol. 141, pt. 10; 104th Congress, 1st sesssion, pp. S1026-S1040). Washington, D.C.

Valverde, G., & Schmidt, W. (1997). Refocusing U.S. math and science education: International comparisons of schooling hold important lessons for improving student achievement. Issues in Science and Technology, 14(2), 60-66.

Weick, K. E. (1976). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. Administrative Science Quarterly, 21(3), 1-19.

Wolk, R., & Olson, L. (Eds.). (1997). Quality counts: A report card on the condition of public education in the 50 states. (Vol. XVI). Washington, D.C.: Editorial Projects in Education, Inc.

APPENDIX ONE

Survey of National H./S.S. Curriculum Documents: Methods Described, and Summary of Findings

Part One: Survey Methods Described

I conducted this survey in order to identify where national consensus exists or does not, regarding what constitutes good H./S.S. curriculum and pedagogy. I employed the results of this survey to construct a credible framework for making judgements regarding which curricular and pedagogical changes taking place in Marwood might constitute educational "drag" or enhancement.

For this survey, I identified an initial list of frameworks which, on the basis of my curricular work, I knew to either have been nationally influential in K-12 H./S.S. education, or (in one instance) a book I knew to be representative of a significant curricular perspective not represented by any of those frameworks. Next, to check whether this list included all of the nationally influential standards documents, I asked Boston University Professor Paul Gagnon, long a nationally prominent figure in K-12 H./S.S. standards development, to review the list for comprehensiveness. Professor Gagnon identified several additional frameworks which I had overlooked, which he said had received widespread national attention. I included these frameworks in the survey. Finally, I also asked Harvard Graduate School of Education Professor Sally Schwager, who is a member of my ad hoc committee and who prepares Harvard's M.Ed. students for H./S.S. teaching positions, to double-check the list for its comprehensiveness.[5]

Once the list of documents had been generated, based upon my prior knowledge of H./S.S. curriculum, I identified a list of key, and/or controversial curricular/ pedagogical propositions which I anticipated that these documents might either support or reject. I generated a Microsoft Excel matrix. On the vertical axis, I listed the 12 curricular texts. On the horizontal axis, I listed these propositions, in question form. Also on the horizontal axis, I created a column to keep track of each document's views regarding the purposes of H./S.S. education, and kept track of which organizations had been involved in the crafting of each text (this data not discussed or reported in this study).

Next, I began to read the documents. As I read, I occasionally discovered that frameworks took stands on issues that I had not thought to include along the horizontal axis. Thus, at intervals, I added new propositions to the matrix. Whenever I identified a particular text's stand regarding a particular question, I recorded that stance, and its location in the framework text.

When the survey was complete, I examined each column of the matrix in turn, to identify how the twelve framework documents concurred and/or differed on each identified issue. As I reviewed this data, I wrote a memorandum for each column/curricular proposition, detailing my understandings regarding the similarities and differences among the different frameworks. The full matrix, and the associated memoranda, are included in what I hope are an accessible format, in Part 2 of this Appendix. Please read the "Key to Appendix One Matrices" carefully before attempting to review the data presented in Part 2.

---

[5] These are the documents included in the survey. (Bradley Commission on History in Schools, 1989; California State Board of Education, 1987; Center for Civic Education, 1994; Council of Chief State School Officers, 1994; Council of Chief State School Officers, American Historical Association, American Institutes for Research, National Council for History Education, & Studies, 1994; Council of Chief State School Officers, Center for Civic Education, & Research, 1998; Engle, 1993; Evans & Brodkey, 1996; Evans, Newmann, & Saxe, 1996; Geography Education Standards Project, 1994; Hahn, 1996; Massialas, 1996; National Center for HIstory in the Schools, 1992; National Center for History in the Schools, 1994; National Center for History in the Schools, 1997; National Commission on Social Studies in the Schools

Ultimately, on the basis of these matrices and memoranda, I was able to generate the summary of findings presented in columns one and two of Table One, presented in the text of the Qualifying Paper itself.

Curriculum Task Force, 1989; Nelson, 1996; Ochoa-Becker, 1996a; Ochoa-Becker, 1996b; Saunders, Calderwood, & Hansen, 1984).

Appendix One, Part 2: Matrices Detailing Frameworks' Positions On Each of the Curricular Propositions, *and* Associated Memoranda

KEY TO APPENDIX ONE MATRICES:

On the top of each of the pages that follow, a curricular proposition is presented. Below the proposition, the stands taken by the curriculum framework documents listed in the 12 boxes on this page, are presented at the matrix locations corresponding to the locations identified on this "KEY" page. Thus, for example, on each page, the curricular position taken by the National Standards for Civics and Government can be found in third box from the left, top column.

Beneath each matrix, I indicate whether there is an affirmative consensus among these documents on the proposition in question.

After the last of the matrices, the short analytical memos which I have crafted regarding each proposition are attached.

History-Social Science Framework for California Public Schools, California State Board of Education and California State Department of Education (1987)	National History Standards: National Center for History in the Schools, U.C.L.A. (1994)	National Standards for Civics and Government, Center for Civic Education (1994)	Geography For Life: National Geography Standards: U.S. D.O.E. N.E.H., and National Geographic Research and Exploration Society (1994)
Building a History Curriculum: Guidelines for Teaching History in Schools, Bradley Commission on History in Schools (1989)	U.S. History Framework for the 1994 N.A.E.P.: Council of Chief State School Officers, A.H.A., American Institutes for Research, the National Council for History Education, and N.C.S.S., for the N.A.E.P. Governing Board (1994)	Handbook on Teaching Social Issues, National Council of the Social Studies (1996)	Geography Framework for the 1994 National Assessment of Educational Progress: Council of Chief State School Officers for the National Assessment Governing Board (1994)
Lessons from History: Essential Understandings and Historical Perspectives Students Should Acquire: The National Center for History in the Schools, U.C.L.A. (1992)	Charting A Course: Social Studies for the 21st Century National Commission on Social Studies in the Schools (1989)	Civics Framework for the 1998 National Assessment of Educational Progress: Council of Chief State School Officers, Center for Civic Education, for the N.A.E.P. Governing Board (1998)	A Framework for Teaching the Basic Concepts, Second Edition: Joint Council on Economic Education (1984)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Should H./S.S. curriculum be articulated, K-12?

YES! See page 5, #7.	To avoid over-stuffing in 9-12, the framework urges "well-designed, articulated curr. planning w/in the jurisdiction of local schools (p. 12)," which covers much of the w.h. content in pre-H.S. years so that H.S. can focus in on a more limited set of content.	While the framework identifies particular topics and skills that should be developed k-4,5-8, and 9-12 (e.g, pp. 141-5) , no particular sequence for dealing with the standards is suggested.	The framework identifies six elements of geographic understanding, and within each element, between two and five learning standards that students should attain. The six include "the world in spatial terms, places and regions, physical systems, human systems, envir. and society, and the uses of geography (pp. 33-35)." The standards include items like "the characteristics, distrib., and migration of human populations on Earth's surface," or "how physical systems affect human systems." "T's and other curr. developers will need to recognize that the students' mastery of geog. skills must be sequenced effectively so that the students retain and build upon their understanding (p. 45)."
YES: Emphasized repeatedly, at p. 19 (points 2, 4 &5) and at pp. 22-3 (points 5 through 8).	U.S. History curriculum should move through a series of chronologically-ordered periods, and should focus on four core themes (characterized -roughly, as: change and continuity; gathering of peoples; Impact of Econ. and Tech change on society; U.S. in the world) (pp. vi-vii).	"[A] likely complaint is that this [curric.] will lead to a superficial hodge-podge of topics and issues in no logical sequence. We are sensitive to this argument. While there may be no absolutely best logical sequence for social study, we have endeavored to sequence the courses in our proposal from the study of issues and topics close to students' lives, to issues they will face as adults, some of which seem further from students' immediate experience (p 260?)." Elsewhere (pp. 2-4), "...there is no inherent curricular logic or sequence in which [topics/social issues] should be studied.... arrangements might follow a variety of structures." Second principle of curr. development (pp. 2-4): ..."topics and issues need to be connected through some kind of thematic, disciplinary, interdisciplinary, or historical structure...."	While the framework describes a curricular structure in which students' acquire progressively more and more sophisticated skills, and understanding of geographical problems and questions, there is no argument here for a particular k-12 sequence of topics or themes. All themes should be attended to at all grade levels (pp. 13-31)
Lessons from History organizes its curriculum chronologically. In each era, the framework identifies a theme or two to put at the center of the curriculum, andouescribes in some detail how that theme ought to be discussed and addressed. The framework identifies "essential understandings that must be addressed, and habits of mind that can naturally be fostered by addressing the identified theme(s) and understandings. Finally, major topics to be taught are listed.	YES: p. viii; p. 3	The framework makes no recommendations about what to teach in a given year, or about how to teach the material. However, the framework also identifies which skills and understandings should be acquired by the 4th, 8th and 12th grade years.	Yes, though how so is only vaguely articulated. Framework urges teachers to move from the simple to the complex, from concrete to abstract, from known to unknown, and from observation to reasoning, one presumes both within individual activities and, in general, as students get older (pp. 67-9).

Consensus? YES.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Should students take H./S.S. for most of the years between K -12, including not less than three years from 9-12?

13 years: K-12 (p. 3)	History education should begin in the youngest years of schooling (p. 3). More history instruction is better than less (this is a w.h. framework, and therefore doesn't speak to how many years of H/SS curr, in general, would be desirable. But the framework does call for three years of W.H. between 5th and 12th grade (p. 16).	Not addressed b/c not within the purview of the document. Framework only deals with civics, rather than the full H/SS scope and sequence.	Not addressed, but the framework is certainly pushing for schools to require more geographic education of all students.
At least 4 years, in grades 7 - 12.	Not addressed b/c not within the purview of the document. Framework only deals with U.S. history, rather than the full H/SS scope and sequence.	Not addressed.	not addressed.
The first chapter argues for a lot of history education (p. 3). Citing many recent calls for increased and more comprehensive history education, the chapter (by Gagnon) asserts that students should get "a significant increase in the time currently devoted to history in most schools (p. 23)." (Also, pp. 8-9) The essential minimum requirement: 4 years between grades 7 and 12, and history ed. in all grades K-6 (p. 23), including no less than three full years of U.S. history and two years of w.h. (p. 24).	Three years of world and American history combined; full year of electives in the senior year.	Advocates for sustained, systematic attention to civic education K-12. Substantial attention to civic education is unusual in K-8 H/SS curriculum; history courses do not focus sufficiently on political history; less than half of the states require a semester-long course in civics. Major differences in civics knowledge between whites and other ethnic groups, and between boys and girls (p. 8). Typically, American students have in the past been shown to have only a superficial understanding of civics (p. 9).	The framework establishes a set of concepts that students should understand, but doesn't suggest how much time will be necessary to grasp them all.

Consensus? YES

Should all students be exposed to a common core of knowledge and skills?

The framework doesn't argue that a common core is a source of ed'l. equity (it's too early to include this argument, which emerged later on as the systemic reform movement gained momentum).	YES! "The purposes of the national standards developed in this document are three-fold: (1) to establish high expectations for what all students should know and be able to do; (2) To clarify what constitutes successful achievement; and (3) *most significantly, to promote equity in the learning opportunities and resources to be provided all students in the nation's schools (ital. in original)* (p 15)."	Argument for universal civics education is couched in terms of 'safeguarding democracy.' First, Jefferson is quoted, then Goals 2000. But the framework also says that "Civic education.... is particularly important for students in less privileged socio-economic circumstances. Research tells us that if these students are to have the oppty to acquire the k. and skills essential for informed, effective citizenship, it must be provided at the elem. and secondary levels of their educ. (p. 2)."	Mostly, there is lip-service to the idea of equity. Equity comes up only occasionally, and how to achieve it is never addressed. A few throw aways are presented: "Consider what must be done to implement the standards so that all students, regardless of background or aspirations for the future, can grow to be productive and enlightened citizens in a democracy and in today's global society. (p.. 9)" "The ...standards represent a consensus on what constitutes a world-class ed. in geog. for all American students (p. 26)."
1892 History subcommittee of Committee of Ten argued that all students, whether or not college-bound, should take four years of history on the 2ndary level. "Unhappily, this common, democratic curr. did not survive the ed'l. changes made during and after W.W.I....Now the Bradley Comm. declares once more that history should occupy a large and vital place in the ed. of the private person and the public citizen (p 1)." "... history ought to be an important part of the ed'l. experience of every American... (p. 3) (and again, on p. 4).	The NAEP doesn't provide different tests for different "tracks" of students, or for different socioeconomic groups. The assumption is that everyone should be able to take and pass the test. But this is never discussed as a pointed attempt to increase equity among students' educational opportunities. The closest they come to mentioning equity is that in the section explaining the context for the 1994 NAEP assessment, they quote Goals 2000, that "every school in America will ensure that students learn to use their minds well.... (pp. 14-15)"	The best kinds of curriculum emerge within indiv. classrooms, in response to pressing social issues, the local context, and in dialogue with students.	[Acc. to Goals 2000], "all U.S. students are expected to demonstrate competency in challenging subject matter by the year 2000 (p. 2)." Equity is never discussed as a goal unto itself.
"...reformed social studies curr. should be required of all students in common, regardless of their "track" ... or further... plans. Only such a common core is democratic.... Something is wrong when the learning often considered necessary and appropriate for university-bound students is treated as unnecessary or irrelevant for the others.... diverse and imaginative teaching methods must be applied in developing the common core of what is most worth learning with all of our diverse learners. A common core and varied methods are the twin imperatives for democratic schooling (p 9)." (see also p. 21)	The framework identifies an "indispensible core" of social studies curric. which all students should take. "A way must be found to challenge all students, not just those already committed (p. ix)." [The benefits of a good social studies education] "can and must [be] provide[d] to all -- not just leaders, or the college-educated, or the technologically up to-date (p. xi)." "To the extent that we fail to educate all persons toward decision-making .... we reduce our own resources and endanger our own future (p. xi)." "The core of essential knowledge [should] be incorporated in the instructional program at every level... (p. 4)"	Major differences in civics knowledge between whites and other ethnic groups, and between boys and girls (p. 8). Typically, American students have in the past been shown to have only a superficial understanding of civics (p. 9). NAEP presents these facts as rationales for the framework and test.	The framework suggests all students should get some economic education to improve their capacities for citizenship and personal economic efficacy (see ed'l. purposes column). Nowhere does the framework argue that universal access to basic economic knowledge/skills will promote equity.

Consensus? YES

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Should that core contain a balance of western and non-western/ canonical and non-canonical material?

"This framework incorporates a multicultural perspective throughout the H/SS curriculum (p. 5)." "While emphasizing the centrality of Western civilizations as the source of American political institutions, laws and ideology, the world history sequence stresses the concept of global interdependence...." "This framework increases the place of world history in the curr to three years (at grades 6, 7, and 10) (p. 6)."	The framework asserts the importance both of knowledge of local and U.S. geography, and attention to the interconnectedness of people and regions around the globe. If anything, the emphasis is on the latter rather than the former.	Not discussed (and possibly not applicable)	The framework asserts the importance both of knowledge of local and U.S. geography, and attention to the interconnectedness of people and regions around the globe. If anything, the emphasis is on the latter rather than the former.
Urges 50/50 weight/time for Western civ, and study of the rest of the world. Calls both "vital" (pp. 8, 13-15, 20-21).	Framework urges attention to "the multiple experiences and perspectives of the nation's diverse racial, ethnic, and cultural groups..." is typical (see also, p. v). Also, the framework urges balanced presentation of America's strengths and weaknesses, achievements and failings (pp v and 12).	"selected authors promote a definition of social studies that is committed to helping young children develop the ability to make informed and reasoned decisions for the public good as citizens of a culturally diverse, democratic society in an interdependent world (p. 100)." Ladson Billings advocates for multicultural education "to restructure curric and ed'l. institutions so that students from diverse social class, racial and ethnic groups - as well as both gender groups - will experience equal educational opportunity (p. 100)." Advocates "inserting race, class and gender into social studies curriculum and re-constructing instruction into an issues-centered approach." Issues centereed curriculum shares power in determining curric, and thus gives language minority (and one would assume all groups') students "voice. (p. 100)" Issues-centered curric. is relevant; involves students in social action which bridges home, school and community (p. 101).	The framework asserts the importance both of knowledge of local and U.S. geography, and attention to the interconnectedness of people and regions around the globe. If anything, the emphasis is on the latter rather than the former.
"What is needed is the effective integration into the hist. narrative of men and women from all classes and conditions, ethnic and racial origins, national and religious backgrounds.	YES. Urges at least equal time be devoted to study of non-American history (both Western and non-Western) (p. 3).	Not discussed (and possibly not applicable)	Not applicable

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Consensus? YES

Should the curriculum leave room for deep topical exploration?

"This framework emphasizes the importance of studying major historical events and periods in depth as opposed to superficial skimming of enormous amounts of material (p. 5)."	"These standards represent a forceful commitment to world-scale history (p. 4)." "Standards should strike a balance between emphasizing broad themes...and probing specific historical events, ideas, movements, persons, and documents (p. 3)." "In writing the standards a primary task was to identify those developments in the past that involved and affected relatively large numbers of people and that had broad sig.... W/in this framework students are encouraged to explore in depth particular cases of hist. change that may have had only regional or local importance but that exemplify the drama and humane substance of the past (p. 4)." "Q: Won't these bulleted standards each require a separate lesson or sequence of lessons, and doesn't the total teaching load therefore far exceed the total number of teaching days avail., even over three years of instruction? No. Good teaching... will often devel. two or more of these ...standards in a single lesson or sequence of lessons.... (p. 14)."	Not applicable	not applicable
Rhetoric is strongly in favor of depth. Urges that we avoid "over-crowded" curriculum and "over-stuffed texts (p. 3; p. 26). Urges selective choice of content in W.H., to assure that attention is focused on vital themes, significant questions and developments (pp. 14-5; also, p. 19).	Not broached as a topic. Perhaps this is because U.S. History is generally less plagued with this curricular tension than world history or global studies. In U.S. history, teachers "only" have to cover about 250 years of history in one year, instead of 1000 or more and can focus on only one country instead of an entire globe.	"Each course would be built around the reflective investigation of central questions, problems and issues. Each course would also allow for the kind of in depth study required for meaningful social education.... (pp. 257-9)" First principle for curr. devel. (pp. 2-4): "First, depth of understanding is more important than coverage and superficial exposure. This means that topics must be studied in sustained ways that introduce students to important complexities and details...."	not applicable
"One of the toughest, unavoidable challenges of teaching history is to provide students with both breadth and depth. Hist. understanding cannot do w/o the broad perspectives gained from chron. narrative. But neither can it ignore the complexities and consequences of critical moments and places examined in depth. .... Closer looks are necessary so that students will not fall into some of the tempting traps opened by the superficial sorts of chronology-w/o-interpretation that many textbooks present (p. 18)." ".... From the enormous storehouse of hist. knowledge, what shall we select to teach (p. 23)?" (An entire chapter devoted to this problem, pp. 23 - 44). "The enormous scope and detail of history requires that teachers select a number of continuing themes and questions to carry through their courses and to use as point of discussion around which to organize their material (p. 27)." The framework proposes four major themes, and articulates them in more depth pp. 28-40. "'coverage' is not enough by itself; it is a recipe for boredom, superficiality and worst of all, for serious misunderstanding of the nature of history (p. 43)."	"Breadth and depth must coexist or alternate... (p. ix)." "Superficial coverage should be replaced with ... in-depth studies (p. 3)." "...provide time for in-depth study (p. 4)."	Not applicable, since the civics material is relatively less enormous, and can be spread over many years of education.	"Instructional efforts should concentrate on aiding students to achieve a fundamental understanding of a limited set of economic concepts and their interrelationships (p 2)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Consensus? YES

Should the curriculum leave room for flexibility and discretion on the part of local districts and individual teachers?

Actually, the framework is fairly prescriptive. It lays out what courses are to be taught in which years, and what is to be covered in each course (in terms of themes, and topics). The number of themes and topics to be covered in the 10th grade year (modern w.h.) takes up 8 pages of single-spaced, descriptive text, and requires attention to around a dozen separate, massive units. (see pp. 84-92)	"Individual states and local school districts might choose to modify these particular recommendations when developing their curr frameworks (p. 12)." "... these standards are intended to open possibilities, not to limit teachers' options for engaging students in lively activities w/in what has been called the 'thinking curriculum (p. 14).'"	The curriculum doesn't preclude it; the content and skills can be taught via many different course curricula, or as a civics and government course.	"While all of the National Geog standards are applicable and relevant to all states and school districts, different emphases are possible and desirable (p. 37).... (In Alaska, they might emphasize the Environment and Society standards... by focusing on resouces and the potential impact of human activities.... In PA, they might focus on the environmental consequences of resource exhaustion... Montana might emphasize Standard 12, the processes, patterns and functions of human settlement. "Illustrative examples can be tailored to local contexts (37)."
Teacher discretion is vital (p. 3). So is teacher involvement in all phases of curriculum development and implementation (pp. 22; 26).	The framework crafters hope to recognize "local and state variations in teaching," and to encourage "the innovativeness and creativity of the individual classroom teacher (p. 16)."	...there is no inherent curricular logic or sequence in which [topics/social issues] should be studied. It must be left up to teachers and curriculum developers to arrange and organize topics and to select the most fundamental content.... (pp. 2-4)" The rationale for issues-centered education "will vary from community to community.... (p. 7)."	It appears to leave plenty of room for teachers to make their own decisions regarding what topics to teach, and when to teach them. The framework primarily identifies skills and modes of analysis that students should learn, and suggests, in general, in which years (K-4; 5-8, or 9-12) it would be appropriate to teach them.
"Teachers themselves... must be the final judges of what in this material is appropriately developed with their students and what is enrichment -- hist. background on which they themselves can draw in explaining events.... (p. 49)"	Unlike the Bradley Commisssion, NCSS recommends just one k-12 sequence, and proposes that all students in the nation follow it (pp. 7-18).	The framework makes no recommendations about what to teach in a given year, or about how to teach the material. However, the framework also identifies which skills and understandings should be acquired by the 4th, 8th and 12th grade years.	Yes. It acknowledges that economics will be taught as an integrated aspect of other core subjects. It leaves the decisions about when and how to integrate up to local districts and teachers.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Consensus? YES

Should higher-order thinking skills be emphasized in the curriculum?

Yes. "The framework proposes that critical thinking skills be included at every grade level (p. 7)." In the framework's descriptions of instructional goals like 'historical literacy, and "geographical literacy," etc., the strongly dominant emphasis is upon teaching habits of mind rather than content knowledge, though content knowledge is emphasized as important, too (pp. 12-19). The framework also urges t'ing students "personal skills," "group ineraction skills," and "social/political participation skills" (p. 24). (see also, p. 25) "... advanced hist., pol, and civic learnings and advanced critical thinking skills are developed in grades nine through twelve (p. 76)."	The framework identifies two types of standards: "Historical thinking skills," and " Historical understandings (p. 2)." Thinking skills include evaluating evidence, developing comparative and causal analyses, interpreting the historical record, and constructing sound historical arguments and perspectives on which informed decisions in contemporary life can be based (p. 2)." Criteria # 1 for the devel of standards: "Standards should be intellectually demanding reflecting the best historical scholarship, and promote active questioning and learning rather than passive absorption of facts, dates and names.... (p. 3)." See also criteria # 6. See also pages 7 &8, which explicate in more detail than I quote in the following parenthesis ("Students must develop competence in the following five types of hist. thinking: Chronological thinking, historical comprehension, historical analysis and interpretation, historical research capabilities, & historical issues-analysis and decision-making."	Intellectual skills in civics and gov't. are inseparable from content. To be able to think critically about a pol. issue for ex., one must have an understanding of the issue, its history, and its contemporary relevance as well as a set of intellectual tools or considerations useful in dealing with such an issue (p. 3). The "higher order" nature of the skills these standards require are explicated at p 5. However, the illustrative performance standard provided in Appendix B de-emphasizes the importance of such skills. It illustrates the difference between basic, proficient, and advanced performance on a descriptive standard, i.e., one for which students need do no more than describe and give examples. No higher order skills involved.... (pp. 148-150)	Framework identifies five skill sets: "Asking geographic questions, acquiring geographic information, organizing geog. info., analyzing geog. info.," and the culminating skill: "answering geog. questions (pp. 43-44)." "Many of the capabilities that s's need to devel. geog. skills are termed critical thinking skills. Such skills are not unique to geog. and involve a number of generic thinking processes, such as knowing, inferring, analyzing, judging, hypothesizing, generalizing, predicting and decision-making (p. 45)."
YES! See 'acquisition of content knowledge, at left. Development of 'Habits of Mind' is core function of H./S.S. education (p. 9, p. 23, p. 28).	Yes! 70% of the 1994 12th grade U.S. History N.A.E.P. focused on what the crafters deemed "higher order" analytic skills, while only 30% focused on demonstration of historical knowledge and perspective. "Using themes to relate particular facts requires the development of historical reasoning skills... the analysis of cause and effect.... Historical study should enable students to think and judge evidence responsibly, independently, imaginatively, and critically (p. 13)." There needs to be a careful balance between "the need for knowledge of specific dates and facts and the need for developing concepts... and intellectual skills (p. v)." The framework clearly urges that history be presented in all of its complexity (p. v; p. 11, p. 13), that students should undertake inquiry in the mode of historians (p. vi), and that controversial, open-ended questions should drive instruction (pp. 19-23). The Governing Board declares its intent to giv a tough test: "We hope the assessment will serve as a stimulus... helping our schools set their sights high (p. viii)."	YES. See Foreword (or any other part of the Handbook). "Citizenship today requires us to find our way among competing interests, rights and responsibilities.... [Controversial] issues cannot be avoided in developing responsible citizens.... In the end, it is... questioning and challenging that allows the past to become useful ... " [Issues-centered education] is a substitute for the non-thinking, memory-bound process which constitutes so much of the ed'l. curr. today... (pp. vi-vii)." "The focus of our curric. is on the critical thinking process, part of any intellectual endeavor but beyond the scope of any one discipline or combination of disciplines (p. 260?)." "[Issues-centered ed. should] not just raise questions... but... teach students to offer defensible and intellectually well-grounded answers to these questions....(pp. 2-5)"	Focus should be on developing a "spacial perspective" on the arrangement and interaction of people and places. Attends to four questions: what is it? Where is it? (definitely "knowledge" questions, though possibly also "analytical" in nature), Why is it there? and What is the significance of its location? (Certainly thinking questions...) (p. 6). Also to five "analytic concepts": "scale, change, diversity, models and systems (p. 7)," and urges use of "analytic skills" to make sense of geographic information (p. 8). Three themes in geographic education are especially analytic: human/environmental interaction; movement, and regions (p. 9). N.A.E.P. is designed to assess students' content knowedge and thinking (p. 13).
Gagnon urges that historical ed. debunk oversimple-minded generalizations about the past: "Teachers need to be wary of presenting the past as the present writ small, or faintly." He warns against the assumption of "progress," and against teaching that "winners" were naturally superior rather than the beneficiaries of circumstance. He urges teaching about the complexity of causality (pp. 18-20)."	YES: Bu. gets less emphasis here than in Bradley Commission's document (p. ix; 3)	Emphasis is placed on both intellectual and participatory skills necessary for citizenship (p. 18). These skills are classified as "identifying and describing, explaining and analyzing, and evaluating, taking and defending positions on public issues (p. 24)." (Then, these skills are explained/described in much detail, pp. 24-31).	"Students should be given a conceptual framework to help them organize their understanding of econ., and they should be exposed to a manner of thinking that emphasizes systematic, objective analysis (p. 2)." On pp. 6&7, the framework lays out a sequential process by which "objective" decision-making can proceed. This can "help students organize their thinking about issues...(p. 7)." Skills and knowledge to aecquire include: intelligent reading of newspapers and magazines, pereceptive watchers of T.V., careful listeners to radio, and critical observers of the pol process (p. 3). Students should learn how to understand tables, graphs, and core mathematical concepts like "average," "median," etc. (pp. 45-51)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Consensus? YES

Should pedagogy include varied, hands-on teaching strategies?

"This framework supports a variety of content-appropriate t'ing methods that engage students in the learning process (p. 7)." "This framework emphasizes the importance of history as a story well told.... The story of the past should be lively and accurate as well as rich with controversies.... (p. 4)."	Because entire document is addressed towards identifying what *students* should know and be able to do, teaching methods are not addressed. However, the myriad "examples of student achievement" provided in standards could only be produced by students in classes taught using active, varied, hands-on teaching strategies.	This framework actually sets standards for teachers, including some addressing teachers' "ability to communicate their knowledge, their pedagogical skills..." This framework puts major emphasis on participatory civic skills: monitoring politics and government, influencing political decisions (p. 6), oral and visual presentations, community participatory activities(p. 147). These can't be taught via chalk, talk, and week-end quizzes. To teach students their standards, a teacher would have to vary instructional techniques quite a bit (see, for ex., p. 4).	Yes. For ex.: "Students ... can display geog. info. in many engaging and effective ways -- for ex., by using multimedia, such as combinations of pictures, maps, graphs, and narratives.... Geog. info. can also be presented through the use of poems, collages, plays, journals, and essays (p. 44)."
YES. See pages 24-28.	Yes. Students are to undertake historical inquiry in the mode of historians, and are to be exposed to widely varied materials along the way (p. vi; p12). The framework crafters hope to encourage "the innovativeness and creativity of the individual classroom teacher (p. 16)."	Absolutely. They critique the status quo, which, they assert, the data has shown to generally consist of textbook-dependent, dull ("sterile") chronology-driven instruction (Foreword)	Framework encourages "an active mode of inquiry (p. 6)."
diverse and imaginative teaching methods must be applied in developing the common core of what is most worth learning with all of our diverse learners. A common core and varied methods are the twin imperatives for democratic schooling (p 9)." Students should... frame questions for discussion and debate, write and speak their own minds frequently on significant topics (p. 21)." "The recommendations [in this document] were developed on the assumption that schools will be moving toward the richer, more inclusive program of history recommended by the Center and by every major curr. reform proposal of recent years (p. 24)." (see also, p. 41-2)	YES: on p. 4, the document promotes a range of teaching methods	No reference to teaching techniques is made. However, the content, skills and dispositions which students are supposed to acquire can not easily be taught w/o deviating from chalk & talk. For ex., students are to learn how to do "researching, questioning of public officials, attending of public meetings, using computer networks, speaking & testifying before public bodies," etc. (p. 72)	The framework does urge use of the case-study approach (pp. 58-66), but otherwise says very little about pedagogy (in fact, the framework suggest teaching the two case studies using the same teaching strategies or structured formulae). The assumption is that economic concepts will be taught through many other disciplines, but how that might best be accomplished gets little attention. A section dealing with "Strategies for teaching Econ. at the various grade levels" concurs with the suggestions re sequencing of economic concepts, in that it urges teachers to move from the simple to the complex, from concrete to abstract, from known to unknown, and from observation to reasoning, both within individual activities and, in general, as students get older.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Consensus? YES

Should varied, hands-on teaching materials, presenting multiple perspectives on topics/issues be employed?

YES (p. 4, #4)! On p. 22, the framework actually provides a list of (civics-related) documents which students "should examine."	YES! See criteria for standards, #7, p. 3. See also careful explication of this point, p. 17. See also, the "Teaching Resources for W.H. section, pp. 285-302.	Yes. For ex., the framework claims that for students should "be able to take and defend positions on the influence of the media on American political life," and asserts that to do this effectively, they should be able to evaluate historical and contemporary political communications. Examples provided include historical speeches, government information programs, campaign advertisements, etc. (p. 4).	Absolutely. The framework calls for students to assess the validity and utility of primary and secondary source material, to read and even to create a wide variety of maps and graphic displays of information (see e.g., pp 184; 186), to use a mixture of quantitative and other data as a basis for analysis, etc. (see, for ex., pp. 53-56). "It is essential to be aware that many perspectives exist and that learning to understand the world from many points of view enhances our knowledge and skills (p. 57)." See also the description of various sources to be used in geographic education, pp. 60-65).
Yes, though relatively briefly. Commission critiques over-stuffed textbooks, and insubstantial "innovative" materials (p. 26). Use of primary sources is urged (p. 7; p. 24).	Yes! (p. 12; p. 13)	YES. Engle holds up as exemplary an inspiring teacher she had who built his curriculum around controversy (p. viii). The curric. would require "sufficient prep time to locate and create appropriate materials (p. 260?)." Curric. should develop "skills in perspective consciousness, the ability to recognize, examine, evaluate, and appreciate multiple perspectives on a particular issue or concern (p. 2)." Hahn cites several studies which seem to show that students enjoy issues-centered social studies more than textbook-driven courses: "'expert' teachers share a willingness to encourage students to explore contentious issues, using both content and pedagogy to give students practice in decision-making about issues that citizens face (p. ?)" open classroom climate is somewhat correlated w/ student interest in the political world, political efficacy, articulations of civic responsibility, and reduced alienation. It can also increase student tolerance (pp. 30-33). "practices in soc. studies that emphasize textbooks, lectures, and memorization... discourage students fror	Framework asserts the value of exposing students to a wide range of graphic tools: maps, computer graphics, satellite imagery, aerial photographs, atlases, three dimensional models, etc. (pp. 6-7).
students"need to realize that historians may disagree widely on how... facts are to be interpreted (pp. 16-17)."" ...students should always read more than one account of important historical events, should employ original documents (p. 21).	YES! Much more emphasis on employment of varied teaching materials here than in the Bradley document (p. 4)	Yes. The framework actually identifies a set of particularly seminal documents which all students should be exposed to as part of their civics education (p. 20)	The framework urges use of case studies, which present more than one perspective on an issue (pp. 58 - 66).

Consensus? YES

Should students be encouraged to construct their own meaning and interpretation of the topics and issues presented?

YES, p. 25. "The story of the past should be lively and accurate as well as rich with controversies.... (p. 4)" "Major historical controversies and events offer an appropriate forum for discussing the ethics of political decisions and for reflecting on indiv. and social responsibility for civic welfare andin the world today.... (p. 6). "Students should learn that people in a dem. society have the right to disagree, that diff. perspectives have to be taken into acct., and that judgements should be based on reasonable evidence and not on bias and emotion (p. 7)." These comments seem to suggest that students should be pressed to think through the controversies for themselves.	Yes. Students should develop competence in "historical research capabilities, including the ability to formulate hist. Q's from encounters w/ hist. documents, artifacts, photos, visits to historical sites, and eyewitness accts.... to judge (such artifacts') credibility and authority; and to construct a sound hist. narrative or argument concerning it (pp. 7,8)." AND "to analyze whether the decisions reached or the actions takenw ere good ones and why... (p. 8)" "Real hist. understanding requires that students have oppty. to create hist. narratives and arguments of their own (p. 17)." (See also page 29)	Absolutely. Students are encouraged to" evaluate, take, and defend positions" on a host of controversial political/intellectual questions (p. 4).	Yes. Their own geographic understanding, actually. They are to "assess the validity and utility" of others' source materials, to prepare a wide variety of data representations, prepare "integrated summaries on geographic issues (p. 54)," "make inferences, draw conclusions.... use the proceses of analysis, synthesis, evaluation and explanation to interpret geographic information from a variety of sources (p. 55)," etc.
"Well-taugth, hist. and biog. are naturally engaging to students by speaking to their individuality, to their possibilities for choice, and to their desire to control their lives.... History furnishes a wide range of models and alternatives for political choice in a complicated world (p. 5)." The historical "habits of mind" which hist. educators are urged to foster are, collectively, habits which make for intellectual independence (p. 9).	Framework "encourages students to pursue hist in ways that typify historians' approaches to the past.... The t'ing of hist should ... introduce students to the process ... of h inquiry. This process requires critical examination of evidence and careful weighing of facts and hypotheses... (p. vi). "Historical study should enable students to think and judge evidence responsibly, independently, imaginatively, and critically (p. 13)." Students should possess "healthy skepticism (p. 13)."	"Citizenship ed. needs to involve a continued conversation between students and their mentors while they search togetehr for better ways of doing things (p. vii)." (pp. 2-4): Fourth principal of curr. devel: "... students must experience influence and control in the inquiry process. A delicate, judicious balance should be struck between teacher guidance in selection of issues and materials to be studied and student choices in their own education...."	Historical understanding is not applicable here. The framework certainly does encourage students to explore questions and to do their own analysis, so in that sense it does encourage development of students' own political understanding.
"...the good teacher is interested not in manipulation or indoctrination but in acting as the honest messenger from the past -- not interested in possessing students' minds but in presenting them with the power to possess their own. To confer such power on all citizens equly is the first aspiration of ed. in a democracy, for it is essential to self-governing people (p. 21)."	Much emphasis on empowering students to think for themselves, and to become the authors of the future. (e.g., p. xi; p. 3)	"The 3rd component of this Framework, civic dispositions, refers to ... the dispositions to become an independent member of society; respect infividual worth and human dignity; assume the personal, political, and economic responsibilities of a citizen; abide by the "rules of the game" such as accepting the legitimate decisions of the majority while protecting the rights of the minority; participate in civic affairs in an informed, thoughtful, and effective manner...."	Yes, to some extent. The framework urges teachers to give students intellectual bases upon which to assess the "successes" and "failures" of the economy or of particular economic decisions (Is the economy fostering economic freedom, efficiency, equity, security, full employment,price stability, growth, and other goals? - pp. 52-7).

Consensus? YES

Should the curriculum be built around a particular discipline (history, economics, geography) at the core?

"This framework is centerred in the chronological study of history.... H. and geog. Are the two great integrative studies of the field (p. 4)." The t. is expected to integrate the t'ing of history with the other humanities and the social science disciplines. The teacher is also expected to work w/ teachers from other fields, such as the language arts, science, and the visual and performing arts... (p. 4)." (Also, pages 12-19)	"Standards should be founded in chronology, an organizing approach that fosters appreciation of pattern and causation in history (p. 3)." "Stds. ... should integrate fundamental facets of human culture such as rel, sci. and tech., politics and gov't., econ., interactions w/ the environment, intellectual and social life, lit. and the arts (#14, p. 4)." "History is a broadly integrative field... (p. 5)" (Framework urges interwoven study of social, political, sci/tech., economic, and cultural history, w/in a geographic context -- pp. 5-6).	The standards do not suggest that civics should be the 'core' of all H./S.S. education. They DO however, say that Civics education ought to be a curricular focus K-12; schools should not assume that teaching history and geography will provide sufficient civic ed (p. v; p. 2). They also make clear that the study of civics is an interdisciplinary endeavor (p. 2).	"Geog. is an integrative discipline that brings togetehr the physical and humand dimensions of the world in the study of people, places and environments. (p. 18)" Urges special attention to integreation of geography with history and economics.
History should be the core, and provide a framework for studyof the other disciplines (p.2, pp 23 & 25) - especially geographyand biography (p. 19).	History should be the core, and provide a framework for study of the other disciplines (pp. Vi-vii; 11; 12). Geography, the humanities and the social sciences are each named as important (p. 12).	No. "instead of building a curric. around... the academic disciplines, we believe that a more powerful vision for the future of social studies might be built around certain social realities and the ethical questions and possibilities that they raise.... Imagine a semester-long school course titled Race and Ethnicity in American Life; another titled Social Class Stratificaton and Social REsponsibility.... (etc.)(pp. 257)" Curriculum should be "extradisciplinary" and "interdisciplinary. " (pp. 257-9). The disciplinary heart of any given unit should be selected on the basis of what is most appropriate to a given topic, or to given themes. "...necessity demands an issues-centered curriculum.... As humankind develops new soical and political ways of life.... We have reached a time in citizenship education when history can only play a minor role in our preparation for citizenship (foreword)."	
"H. is the most synthesizing of all the disciplines, not just another bundle of subject-matter, but a way of ordering and apprehending reality." (p. 1) History instruction must be integrated with both the social sciences and the humanities (pp. 15,16). Ch. 2 urges focus on five historical spheres: social; sci/tech; economic; religious; political.	Curriculum should interweave hist, geog, econ, anthro, soc, psych, and government to increase students' understanding of human behavior (p. ix.) Pages 29-75 explore what this might mean. BUT: s.s. can be organized around hist and geog (p. xi, p. 3). In fact, the 9th - 11th curricular sequence urged by NCSS is World & American History and Geography (to 1750; to 1900; to present: pp. 14-18). Where possible, curr should be designed to include x-disciplinary linkages (p. 3).	Curr. should be built around five core questions (taken from National Stds. for Civics and Gov't.): "What are civic life, politics and gov't.? What are the fdns. of the Am. pol. system? How does the government est'd. by the Constitution embody the purposes, values and principles of American democracy? What is the rel. of the U.S. to other natons and to world affairs? What are the roles of citizens in Am. dem.? (p. 18)"	"The time allocated to econ. education has always been limited. It may become even more limited as efforts are made to improve the t'ing and learning of traditional basic subjects. As a result, whatever k. of econ. s's acquire comes and will come principally through the intro. of econ into other subjects such as social studies, hist., home econ., and business ed. (p. 4)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Consensus? NO

Should the high school H./S.S. scope and sequence be dominated by 'core' knowledge survey courses, and limit students to one year or less of electives?

Yes. All electives are to be taught in 9th grade. Senior year is divided between a required civics and a required economics class. 10th and 11th are devoted to a two-year mixed U.S./World History course (pp. 75-7).	More or less the same as "Lessons from History." (Same organization, so no surprise, here.) (p. 14 in the U.S. standards; pp. 15-6 in world history standards).	The Civics, Geography, and Economics frameworks outline content and skills to be taught, but do not suggest in which courses the material should be conveyed. Thus, they do not suggest whether there should be more or less survey courses, or electives.	The Civics, Geography, and Economics frameworks outline content and skills to be taught, but do not suggest in which courses the material should be conveyed. Thus, they do not suggest whether there should be more or less survey courses, or electives.
More or less, yes. In three of the four proposed course sequences, only one semester is reserved for electives. In "pattern C," students take electives in 9th grade and then again for a semester in senior year (pp. 20-1).	Not addressed (This framework is focused only on U.S. history, and therefore does not need to address the full scope and sequence of courses from K-12.)	The Handbook is generally opposed to any one, nationally prescribed course sequence. Most of the courses proposed in the Handbook would be electives in a "traditional" school setting, though the Handbook doesn't say one way or the other whether students should be required to take them or not (see Evans & Brodkey, pages 257-9).	The Civics, Geography, and Economics frameworks outline content and skills to be taught, but do not suggest in which courses the material should be conveyed. Thus, they do not suggest whether there should be more or less survey courses, or electives.
Urges a minimum of four years of history (world and U.S.), between 7th and 12th grades. This leaves time for up to two years of electives. But the implication in the language is that more than four years of history survey is probably a good idea (pp. 23-4).	Yes. See pages 14-20.	The Civics, Geography, and Economics frameworks outline content and skills to be taught, but do not suggest in which courses the material should be conveyed. Thus, they do not suggest whether there should be more or less survey courses, or electives.	The Civics, Geography, and Economics frameworks outline content and skills to be taught, but do not suggest in which courses the material should be conveyed. Thus, they do not suggest whether there should be more or less survey courses, or electives.

Consensus? NO

Should all students be exposed to a similar, high-challenge, content-rich curriculum as a way of increasing educational equity?

The framework doesn't argue that a common core is a source of ed'l. equity (it's too early to include this argument, which emerged later on as the systemic reform movement gained momentum).	YES! "The purposes of the national standards developed in this document are three-fold: (1) to establish high expectations for what all students should know and be able to do; (2) To clarify what constitutes successful achievement; and (3) *most significantly, to promote equity in the learning opportunities and resources to be provided all students in the nation's schools (ital. in original)* (p 15)."	Argument for universal civics education is couched in terms of 'safeguarding democracy.' First, Jefferson is quoted, then Goals 2000. But the framework also says that "Civic education.... is particularly important for students in less privileged socio-economic circumstances. Research tells us that if these students are to have the oppty to acquire the k. and skills essential for informed, effective citizenship, it must be provided at the elem. and secondary levels of their educ. (p. 2)."	Mostly, there is lip-service to the idea of equity. Equity comes up only occasionally, and how to achieve it is never addressed. A few throw aways are presented: "Consider what must be done to implement the standards so that all students, regardless of background or aspirations for the future, can grow to be productive and enlightened citizens in a democracy and in today's global society. (p. 9)" "The ...standards represent a consensus on what constitutes a world-class ed. in geog. for all American students (p. 26)."
1892 History subcommittee of Committee of Ten argued that all students, whether or not college-bound, should take four years of history on the 2ndary level. "Unhappily, this common, democratic curr. did not survive the ed'l. changes made during and after W.W.I....Now the Bradley Comm. declares once more that history should occupy a large and vital place in the ed. of the private person and the public citizen (p 1)." "... history ought to be an important part of the ed'l. experience of every American... (p. 3) (and again, on p. 4).	The NAEP doesn't provide different tests for different "tracks" of students, or for different socioeconomic groups. The assumption is that everyone should be able to take and pass the test. But this is never discussed as a pointed attempt to increase equity among students' educational opportunities. The closest they come to mentioning equity is that in the section explaining the context for the 1994 NAEP assessment, they quote Goals 2000, that "every school in America will ensure that students learn to use their minds well.... (pp. 14-15)"	The best kinds of curriculum emerge within indiv. classrooms, in response to pressing social issues, the local context, and in dialogue with students.	[Acc. to Goals 2000], "all U.S. students are expected to demonstrate competency in challenging subject matter by the year 2000 (p. 2)." Equity is never discussed as a goal unto itself.
"...reformed social studies curr. should be required of all students in common, regardless of their "track" ... or further... plans. Only such a common core is democratic.... Something is wrong when the learning often considered necessary and appropriate for university-bound students is treated as unnecessary or irrelevant for the others.... diverse and imaginative teaching methods must be applied in developing the common core of what is most worth learning with all of our diverse learners. A common core and varied methods are the twin imperatives for democratic schooling (p 9)." (see also p. 21)	The framework identifies an "indispensible core" of social studies curric. which all students should take. "A way must be found to challenge all students, not just those already committed (p. ix)." [The benefits of a good social studies education] "can and must [be] provide[d] to all -- not just leaders, or the college-educated, or the technologically up-to-date (p. xi)." "To the extent that we fail to educate all persons toward decision-making .... we reduce our own resources and endanger our own future (p. xi)." "The core of essential knowledge [should] be incorporated in the instructional program at every level... (p. 4)"	Major differences in civics knowledge between whites and other ethnic groups, and between boys and girls (p. 8). Typically, American students have in the past been shown to have only a superficial understanding of civics (p. 9). NAEP presents these facts as rationales for the framework and test.	The framework suggests all students should get some economic education to improve their capacities for citizenship and personal economic efficacy (see ed'l. purposes column). Nowhere does the framework argue that universal access to basic economic knowledge/skills will promote equity.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Consensus? NO

Should more emphasis be placed on recent, more "relevant" H./S.S. content?

Argues that, in general, historical study is preparation for citizenship and for life. "We want our students to understand how people in other times and places have grappled with fundamental questions ... and to ponder how we deal with the same issues today (p. 3)."	"Standards in ... history should include appropriate coverage of recent events.... (p. 4, #12)" "Standards ... shuld utilize regional and local history... (#13, p. 4)"	The justification for civics education implies that it is all "relevant." In other words, all of the content in the curriculum is included to help students become competent citizens (for ex., pp. v, vi, 1). Also, "To be able to think critically about a pol. issue for ex., one must have an understanding of the issue, its history, and its contemporary relevance as well as a set of intellectual tools or considerations useful in dealing with such an issue (p. 3)."	Relevance is articulated only in abstract terms -- i.e., the whole field of study is relevant because it helps students to understand their world and themselves. We should implement the standards so that all students... can grow to be productive and enlightened citizens in a democracy and in today's global society (p. 9). "Humans want to understand the intrinsic nature of their home. Geog. enables them to understand where they are, literally and figuratively. Geog. provides knowledge of Earth's physical and human systems and of the interdependency of living things and physical environments. This k., in turn, provides a basis for humans to cooperate in the best interests of our planet (p. 23)." "Geog. captures the imagination. It stimulates curiosity.... As the interconnectedness of the world accelerates... w/ a strong grasp of geog., people are better able to solve issues at not only the local level but also the global level."
Argues that, in general, historical study is preparation for citizenship and for life. "We can be sure that s's will experience enormous changes over their lifetimes. Hist. is the discipline that can best help them understand and deal with change, and at the same time to identify the deep continuities that link past and present (p. 5)." "...hist furnishes a wide range of models and alternatives for political choice in a complicated world (p. 5)." Also, history is good prep. for many lines of work, and provides transferable skills... (p. 6)	Argues that, in general, historical study is preparation for citizenship and for life. The framework asserts that American History is, in and of itself, "vital" to citizenship, and to developing students' sense that their actions have consequences (pp v, vi, 11).	YES! "Specific current problems would be sutdied, discussed, debated.... The curr. build on student interests in issues affecting their lives.... In each course, t's and students will also study relevant strands of historical development, cases, and cross-cultural and global aspects of the topic being considered..." "The traditional way educators select social studies content for instruction in today's classrooms is dysfunctional.... The content [is] devoid of issues or problems that are of utmost importance to indiv. students and their communities (p. 45)." Issues-centered curr. would raise questions like: "Should I support the building of an incinerator in my community despite its impact on the environment?..." (p. 7)	Relevance is articulated only in abstract terms, i.e., the whole field of study is relevant: "(Geography) helps students appreciate the meaning of their own place in the immediate world of childhood and adolescence (p. 6)."
"Is [historical education] "past-oriented" and "obsolete?" Exactly the contrary. The study of history opens to students the great case book of centuries of human experience. The quicker the pace of change... the more relevant and essential history becomes in preparing people for priveate life and public action (p. 6)." "In order to raise the level of public discourse and the integrity of public institutions (p. 11)" students need" a "comprehensive understanding of their late 20th century world (pp. 11-13)." "It is important that study of times past be linked to the present day. Students need, and very much want, to perceive how everything they have learned possesses meaning for them and their society in the world today (pp. 43-4).	Not directly. In the last two years of high school, though, the framework does call for some courses which are designed to focus on 20th century history and contemporary problems, though (pp. 17-20).	The justification for civics education implies that it is all "relevant." In other words, it's all about becoming competent at participating in one's own society.	The whole curr seems to have been selected to ensure a certain degree of personal, day-to-day competence. The advantages of econ. understanding "b/c apparent as indivs. achieve competence in applying their k. to a wide range of econ. issues they themselves confront (p. 2)." "...when properly employed... approaches... such as personal economics... can help students learn the basic concepts of econ. and how to use these concepts in their own lives and communities (p. 2)."

Consensus? NO

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Should students be expected to participate in their community or polity as apart of their H./S.S. education?

YES, repeatedly on pp. 2-3. See also p. 8: "This framework provides oppties. For s's participation in school and community svc. programs and activities (p. 9)." Also: "The most basic skills of H/SS fields involve.... the ability to discuss and debate and the ability to write a well-reasoned and well-organized essay (p. 26)."	not addressed	The *goal* (ital. in original) of education in civics and government is informed, responsible participaton in political life by competent citizens... their effective and responsible participation requires the acquisition of participatory skills (p. 1)." "The formal curriculum should be augmented by related learning experiences, in both school and community, that enable students to learn how to participate in their own governance (p. 1)."	No. The knowledge and skills are presented as valuable for student growth; the framework doesn't suggest that students should be employing or developing their increased geographic understanding via civic/community activity.
not addressed	not addressed	"Perhaps a service learning component could be built in where appropriate.... (pp. 257-9)" "Ultimately, an issues-centered approach to soc. stds. aims at empowering the learner...[and] should help us solve everyday problems in our lives.... 'This is not critical thinking for the sake of debate.... but for constructive change, for the transformation of society.'" (pp. 2-5, citing Alquist, Alberta: 'Critical ped. for soc. studies t's.' Social Studies Review (1990): 53-7. "For many... the approach also includes developing a critical consciousness.... (pp. 2-5)" "Issues -centered curric... involves students in social action projects which bridge home, school and community (p. 101)."	Purpose of geography ed: "To foster devel of citizens who will actively seek and systematically apply the k. and skills of geography in life situations (p. 5)." Argues that global inter-connectedness of environmental, political, economic and social forces increases the need for "geographic knowledge," and that geographic education prepares students for citizenship, work, parenting, and leadership (p. 5).
no	First characteristic of "a social studies curriculum for the 21st century:" "[It] must ... provide opportunities for active, engaged participation in civic, cultural, and voluntary activities designed to enhance the quality of life in the community and in the nation (p.3)."	"Citizens should understand that through their involvement in civic life and in nongov'tal orgs they can help to improve the qual. of life in their neighborhoods, communities, and nation. They also should understand that if they want their voices to be heard, they must become active participants in the pol process (p. 23)." (more, p. 24)	A hard call. The given rationale for economic education is that it will improve students' understanding of civic and personal economic issues; no mention is made of fostering increased participation in the community or polity.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Consensus? NO

Should students' writing be a special focus of H./S.S. curriculum and pedagogy?

Relatively less emphasis. Mentioned as follows on p. 25: "Writing about the subject matter of h/ss gives students valuable exper. in thinking through their ideas and articulating them." Also, the framework urges s's to develop both speaking and writing skills, on p. 26.	The framework urges that students be asked to undertake a wide range of challenging analytic activities (see pages 17-34), but never implies that writing is central to, or necessary for these activities. So, for ex., students are urged to analyze, compare, hypothesize, but the framework leaves open whether these skills should be demonstrated through public speaking, illustration, writing, or what-have-you.	Yes. See p. 147. However, this framework is the only one to put major emphasis on participatory civic skills (oral and visual presentations, community participatory activities) (pp. & 147).	Writing is NOT given precedence/pride of place. "Students should be able to communicate clearly and effectively.... They can display geog. info. in many engaging and effective ways -- for ex., by using multimedia, such as combinations of pictures, maps, graphs, and narratives.... Geog. info. can alos be presented through the use of poems, collages, plays, journals, and essays (p. 44)."
not addressed	While "basic" students in 12th grade are not expected to be able to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding through writing, to receive a "proficient " NAEP score, students' "written arguments should reflect some in-depth grasp of issues and refer to both primary and secondary sources. "Advanced" students "should be able to write well-reasoned arguments on complex historical topics and draw upon a wide range of sources to inform their conclusions." (p. 51)	Importance of writing is noted when author laments that "[Students] rarely planned or initiated anything; read or wrote anything of some length, or created their own products...." But writing is given no pride of place over creation of products, reading, speculation, or collaboration.... Writing doesn't receive pride of place. (p. v?)	Not addressed. This framework is much more concerned with students' map reading and interpretation skills.
Writing is not given pride of place. The framework urges that students be asked to undertake a wide range of challenging analytic activities, but never implies that writing is central to, or necessary for these activities. So, for ex., students are urged to analyze, compare, hypothesize, but the framework leaves open whether these skills should be demonstrated through public speaking, illustration, writing, or what-have-you.	yes (p. ix; p. 4)	The framework urges that students develop a wide range of challenging analytic skills (see pages 24-31), but never implies that writing is central to, or necessary for these activities.	Not mentioned. More attention to reasoning skills, and to capacity to make sense of statistics, graphs, and media.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Consensus? NO

The following are memoranda briefly analyzing the data regarding each of the curricular propositions presented in the matrices above, in Appendix One.

Should curr. be articulated/ non-redundant?

There is consensus that curriculum should be articulated, and non-redundant.

Should 3-4 years of H/SS be required of all students between 9th and 12th grades?

There is strong consensus that more H/SS education is better than less. All the frameworks push for increased seat-time devoted to H/SS.

Should students' acquisistion of a substantive core of content knowledge be a key curricular objective?

There is a consensus that there is a core of knowledge and ideas which all students should learn. There is also a very strong consensus that "core knowledge" consists of much more than mere, memorizeable facts. However, each framework includes different content and emphases in that "indispensible core."

Do the curricula attempt to balance W. and non-Western content? Traditional canon and multicultural materials?

There is strong consensus that multicultural and non-canonical content (and exposure to non-Western societies) must have a place in H./S.S. curriculum. Each curriculum strikes a different balance regarding the degree to which traditional western/male/political/canonical history ought to be displaced by other content – but in general, the displacement is tremendous. All the history curricula include social, economic, women's, immigrants', scientific/technological historical foci, in addition to old-fashioned politico-military history. The geographic curricula are entirely global in focus, and also very focused on the living activities and patterns of ordinary people. The tension between western and non-western, or canonical/non-canonical material is relatively irrelevant in civics and economics curricula, although even there, foci on comparative government and comparative economics foster a global perspective.

Do the frameworks evince a preference for curricular depth over breadth?

With the exception of the National World History Standards, all the other documents are in rhetorical consensus that depth is more educationally engaging and effective than breadth. Given that world history is the ultimate survey topic, it is perhaps not surprising that a world history framework would make a "forceful commitment" to breadth, and is notable that this framework nonetheless urges teachers to strike a balance between breadth and depth, and to include "in-depth cases." Notwithstanding the rhetoric, however, it is also true that many of the frameworks urge or prescribe coverage of a tremendous amount of content knowledge. Thus, their authors' philosophical commitment to deep exploration often appears to have been overwhelmed by the process of developing curriculum via democratic consensus. In other words, even if every contributor, individually, believes in the efficacy of taking time (periodically, at least) for deeper exploration, when these contributors gather around the table to determine which topics to keep in and which to leave out, it becomes impossible to leave much of anything out. The europhiles want lots of European history; the sinophiles want east Asian history, the social and political and intellectual historians each want their content included, etc. As a result, the actual curriculum documents do not reflect their own philosophical assertions.

Do the curricula advocate flexibility and discretion for localities and/or for teachers?

Somewhat like the frameworks' rhetorical support for depth which is not persuasively borne out by the quantity of content they recommend or require, the majority of the rhetoric and philosophy underlying the curriculum frameworks is strongly in favor of giving local districts and teachers as much autonomy as possible. The strong verbal assertions regarding the importance of local discretion are belied by the structure of a number of the frameworks, which prescribe or recommend a tremendous amount of content. The four frameworks which most visibly bear this trait are "Learning From History;" the "National History Standards," the "N.A.E.P. U.S. History Framework;" and the "Geography for Life" standards. Two frameworks are very prescriptive; and make no rhetorical claims in favor of local discretion or autonomy. The remainder both argue for flexibility, and actually leave room for it. *The key point here, and also regarding the depth/breadth issue, is that there is consensus about what is educationally sound (i.e., room for depth and for local discretion), but that these documents (like the MA. framework and test) fall down in the execution.*

Should higher order thinking skills be emphasized?

Yes! In general, the frameworks place greater emphasis on the importance of teaching students to think, than on any other issue. There is very strong consensus on this point.

Are varied, hands-on, active teaching strategies promoted?

Yes. There is absolute consensus on this point.

Do the frameworks promote use of varied materials presenting multiple perspectives on topics / issues?

Yes. There is absolute consensus on this point as well.

Do the curricula promote students' own construction of historical, political, or social understanding?

There is strong consensus that one of the goals of H./S.S. is to develop independent-minded, informed citizens. Most of the frameworks expect students to develop a range of thinking habits which, if practiced, will result in these ends. Many of the frameworks specifically encourage presentation of multiple perspectives on topics, or multi-disciplinary examinations of topics, so that students have the opportunity to determine for themselves where truth lies, or which elements of a story are most significant. There is also some consensus, however, that students need to be socialized to hold and enact democratic values. So students must construct their own understanding, but from a particular starting position which places value on toleration, a commitment to making change through lawful means, etc.

Should curriculum. be built around a particular disciplinary core?

No consensus exists on this issue. All the history frameworks argue that history ought to be integrative core of any H/SS framework, and the geographers have the audacity to propose that their discipline could be the core instead of history (whoever dared to call geography the handmaiden of history???).

But the N.C.S.S. framework (while also structured as a historical chronology), uses rhetoric to emphasize that a chronological organization should not be seen as giving the discipline of history pride of place. The Handbook on Teaching Social Is flat out opposed to the primacy of history, and emphasizes the importance of interdisciplinarity. The civics frameworks, while not actively opposed to a historical or other disciplinary core, are built around core questions which can be most easily addressed interdisciplinarily.

Should all students be exposed to a similar high-challenge, content-rich curriculum because this will increase educational equity?

In general, these national documents do assert that all students should have access to core knowledge and skills. But the primary and dominant rationales for a core curriculum is that a democracy cannot function unless its citizens are equipped to handle their responsibilities. The argument does arise, that a universal curriculum would equalize the quality of education to all our students and thus promote equity of opportunity, but it arises only in some of the documents. There does not yet seem to be a a national consensus, for example, that de-tracking (and thus truly exposing all students to the same curriculum) would be advisable.

Do the frameworks assert that some academic content is more valuable because it has more contemporary relevance than other content?

There definitely is no consensus on this issue. Some national documents assert, more or less, that content should be learned because it is important unto itself or because it is inherently enriching, or as part of becoming culturally literate. Others have selected only that content which curriculum developers deemed useful for citizenship or life. Once conclusion that one could draw, is that it is important to learn some content for its inherent interest or the cultural literacy or contextual understanding it conveys. But it is also important to provide students with curricular content which is, on its face, relevant and useful to students for life in contemporary times.

Do the curricula advocate for student participation in community or polity?

There is definitely no consensus that civic participation ought to be an element of H./S.S. curriculum. Some frameworks advocate for it emphatically (the civics frameworks made the strongest arguments for making participatory activity part of coursework), but many do not even mention the possibility of including this kind of activity in H./S.S. courses. None of the frameworks describes civic participation as an inappropriate element to include in curriculum.

Should attention to students' writing receive special emphasis?

Writing is given surprisingly little attention in these documents, especially when one considers how important many of the teachers interviewed for my study considered their teaching of writing to be, given the strength of the movement to teach writing "across the curriculum," and given my own personal view that if students are not getting ongoing writing instruction, their H./S.S. education is sub-par. The frameworks are full of standards in which students are to research, analyze, explain, describe, compare, identify patterns within, and otherwise make sense of material. But how they convey this sense-making is left open in the documents: it could hypothetically be via presentation or speech, chart or diagram, play, class participation, artwork, *or* essay or paper. The role of writing in the development or demonstration of sense-making is not, for the most part, deeply pursued or emphasized.

APPENDIX TWO

Departmental Strength Survey Responses

Survey Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
"You can count on most department members to help out anywhere, any time, even if it is not part of their job assignment."	T, T, T, DH	T, S			
"There is little or no cooperative effort among teachers in this department."					T, T, T, T, DH, S
"Teachers in this department are continually learning and seeking new ideas	T, T, T, DH,	T, S			
"Teachers in this department are highly knowledgeable in their fields."	T, T, T, D.H.	T, S			
"Teachers in this department are passionate about their work."	T, T, D.H.	T, T, S			
"Department members' academic standards are very low."			S	DH	T, T, T, T
"Teachers in this department regularly assign essays and papers."	T, T, T, D.H.	T, S			

Table continued, next page

"In this department, teachers rarely or never read multiple drafts of their students' essays and papers."	S. didn't know	D.H.	T, T, T, T		
"Teachers in this department regularly include activities like historical simulations, debates, and examinations of complex and/or conflicting source material in their curriculum."	T, T, T	D.H.	S	T	
"In this department, it is considered no more prestigious and desirable to teach advanced-level classes for upperclassmen than to teach lower-level courses for freshmen."	T	D.H.	T – more desirable, but not more prestigious	S, T, T	
"The faculty of this department is highly respected in the community."	D.H., T	S	T Two T's didn't know		

Respondents:
T = Teacher
D.H. = Department Head
S = Superintendent Fein

APPENDIX THREE

Marwood High School H./S.S. Department's Statement of Educational Goals

SOCIAL STUDIES DEPARTMENT

General Overview:

The staff of the Social Studies Department believe that a social studies program of studies should reflect and develop within our students a type of citizenship called 'democratic citizenship'. This type of citizenship is based on an informed citizen, skilled in the processes of a free society, who is committed to democratic values, and is able, and feels obliged, to participate in the social, political, and economic processes. Schools, in general, have been created for the express purpose of developing citizens who would and can sustain the democratic experiment. Within the school, the social studies department through its curriculum has been designated to develop this basic objective.

The social studies program should be able to assist students in developing skills that will allow them to continue the learning process and participating skills for a lifetime, and in so doing, sustain and fulfill the democratic experiment. These skills can be grouped into three specific areas - acquiring information, organizing and using information, and developing interpersonal skills..

The Social Studies Department of Marwood High School offers a variety of courses in the areas of history, the social sciences, and the behavioral sciences. These courses, and the levels of difficulty there in, provide students with the opportunity to develop skills, broaden perspectives, and acquire attitudes, values, and knowledge essential to continuing personal growth, and also, to develop those skills required for participation in the democratic process.

The departmental goals reflect the historical disciplines and behavioral sciences offerings of the department, such as:

1. An understanding of the major political, social, and economic forces that have shaped the distant and recent past.

2. An awareness of the political, social and economic interdependence of all nations of the world.

3. An involvement in informed decision making at the high school.

4. An awareness of the difficult choices which must be met with respect to progress in a world with limited natural resources.

5. An appreciation of art, literature, and music as they reflect the concerns and values of societies.

6. An appreciation of the contributions of individual men and women, as well as, various ethnic groups to modern civilization.

7. An increased understanding and awareness of self and of other people.

8. A greater understanding of individual and group actions and responsibilities.

9. A respect for the attitudes, rights, and life-styles of all mankind.

10. An involvement in activities directed towards the eventual elimination of prejudice, racism, and intolerance.

11. An understanding and respect for the RIGHTS and RESPONSIBILITIES of a democratic citizen.

APPENDIX FOUR

Memorandum from Caruso and Department, to Marwood Central Office, Outlining Possible Responses to New State Policies Generated During Summer Workshop

To: Dr. **Principal**

From: **Don Caruso**
Social Studies Department

June 17, 1998

Dear Dr.

Please be advised that the Social Studies Department is requesting an increase in graduation requirements in Social Studies from a 3 year to a 4 year requirement beginning with the class of 2003.

This request is necessary given the new curriculum demands of the Massachusetts Social Studies framework.

Don Caruso

Social Studies Department Head

Broad Issues to be addressed concerning the Mass. Frameworks

Frameworks -- We are required to be aligned to the framework -- can't take the MCAS until we are aligned.

Semester Courses -- May preserve more electives.

Staffing: Who will teach newly created courses such as World History II; How will staff schedules change because of drops in electives -- New Staff will be required with match in frameworks and increase in graduation requirements.

Graduation requirements -- Do we need to require 4 years of Social Studies for graduaton because of new demands from State frameworks. Do we specify beyond World History I, II and U.S. History what is required.

Transition Year -- With any new course sequence inplemented there will be a transition period where students will have already taken the course which may be bumped forward and therefore there will be the need for "one time only" transition courses. See schedule to understand.

New Textbooks and supplemental materials will be necessary in World History I, II and U.S. History. For example, the frameworks specifies the inclusion of music, art, economics and literature.

Electives -- What are the fate of electives? Where will single courses match in schedule.

COURSE IMPACT - PLAN A

SCHOOL YEAR 1998-1999

GRADE	YOG	COURSE
9th	2002	World History I
10th	2001	U.S. History
11th	2000	Gov't/Psych/Soc
12th	1999	Electives AAS, AP European, Humanities

SCHOOL YEAR 1999-2000

GRADE	YOG	COURSE
9th	2003	World History I
10th	2002	Semester I - World II Semester II - U.S. History I
11th	2001	Gov't/Psych/Soc
12th	2000	Electives AAS, AP European, Humanities

SCHOOL YEAR 2000-2001

GRADE	YOG	COURSE
9th	2004	World History I
10th	2003	Semester I - World II Semester II - U.S. History I
11th	2002	Semester I - U.S. History II Semester II - Gov't/Psych/Soc
12th	2001	Semesters I & II Gov't/Psych/Soc/AAS/AP European/Humanities

SCHOOL YEAR 2000-2001

GRADE	YOG	COURSE
9th	2005	World History I
10th	2004	Semester I - World II Semester II - U.S. History I
11th	2003	Semester I - U.S. History II Semester II - Gov't/Psych/Soc AP Psych
12th	2002	Semesters I & II ~~Gov't/~~Psych/Soc/AAS/AP European/Humanities

COURSE IMPACT - PLAN B

SCHOOL YEAR 1998-1999

GRADE	YOG	COURSE
9th	2002	World History I
10th	2001	U.S. History
11th	2000	Gov't/Psych/Soc
12th	1999	Electives AAS, AP European, Humanities, Issues

SCHOOL YEAR 1999-2000

GRADE	YOG	COURSE
9th	2003	World History I
10th	2002	World History II
11th	2001	Gov't/Psych/Soc
12th	2000	Electives AAS, AP European, Humanities

No U.S. history

SCHOOL YEAR 2000-2001

GRADE	YOG	COURSE
9th	2004	World History I
10th	2003	World History II
11th	2002	U.S. History
12th	2001	Gov't/Psych/Soc (Can opt out for AAS/AP European/Humanities)

SCHOOL YEAR 2000-2001

GRADE	YOG	COURSE
9th	2005	World History I
10th	2004	World History II
11th	2003	U.S. History
12th	2002	Gov't/Psych/Soc (Can opt out for AAS/AP European/Humanities)

118

Course Impact -- Plan C

School Year 1998-1999

Grade	YOG	Course
9th	2002	World History I
10th	2001	U.S. History
11th	2000	Govt/Psych/Soc
12th	1999	Electives: AAS, AP Eur, Humanities, Issues

School Year 1999-2000

Grade	YOG	Course
9th	2003	World History I Frameworks #3D - #5K
10th	2002	Sem I -- World History in the Modern Era Frameworks #6b, d, f, g, h and #7b, c, f, g, h, i, j, k
		Sem II -- U.S. History from a World Perspective Frameworks #6a, c, e, i, j, k, and #7a, d, e
11th	2001	Sem I -- Govt/Psych/Soc
		Sem II -- Govt/Psych/Soc
12th	2000	Electives

School Year 2000-2001

Grade	YOG	Course
9th	2004	World History I Frameworks #3D-#5K
10th	2003	Sem I -- World History in the Modern Era Frameworks #6b, d, f, g, h and #7b, c, f, g, h, i, j, k
		Sem II -- U.S. History from a World Perspective Frameworks #6a, c, e, i, j, k, and #7a, d, e
11th	2002	Sem I -- U.S. History -- Domestic Issues
		Sem II -- Govt/Psych/Soc
12th	2001	Sem I -- Govt/Psych/Soc
		Sem II -- Electives

** Difference from Plan A is that a Frameworks #6 and #7 will be treated in a full year. Plan A will allot a semester for items #6 and #7

BEST COPY AVAILABLE